The Loyal Baptist:

OR AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

BAPTIZED BELIEVERS.

CONTAINING

I. His humble Resolution to be a constant Conformist to the Scriptures, and especially in these four great Duties, *viz.*

1. To Honour all Men.
2. To Love the Brotherhood.
3. To Fear God.
4. To Honour the King.

According to 1 *Peter* 2. 17.

II. His unfeigned endeavour for Unity in the Truth with the Church of *England*; wherein is shewed what necessitates a distinction in Communion between the Parochial Assemblies and those of the Baptized Believers: Wherein fourteen Arguments lately published by Mr. *N. T.* M. A. in defence of Infant-Baptism are considered, and answered.

III. His Plea for Church-Assemblies to be permitted to the Baptized Believers.

To which purpose is declared,

IV. The Nature of his Call to Christianity, and to the work of the Ministry.

OCCASIONED

By the great and long continued Sufferings of the Baptized Believers in this Nation.

By THOMAS GRANTHAM, a Servant of Christ.

Job 21. 4. *As for me, is my complaint to Man? And if it were so, why should not my Spirit be troubled?*

Causabon's Birth of Heresy, c. 3. p. 11. *In all Ages Men have never been contented with the true Adoration instituted by God: But instead of external Signs instituted by God, --- they have forged and brought in their own Inventions.*

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be Sold by *Tho. Fabian* at the Bible in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard, 1684.

The Loyal Baptist:

OR AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

BAPTIZED BELIEVERS.

BEING ALSO

An Earneſt Perſuaſive to them and all Chriſtians, to ſtudy to be Quiet, and do their own Buſineſs, in theſe important Particulars,

VIZ.
I. *To Honour all Men.*
II. *To Love the Brotherhood.*
III. *To Fear God.*
IV. *To Honour the King.*

Delivered in two Sermons upon 1 *Pet.* 2.17.

By THOMAS GRANTHAM, a Servant of Chriſt.

My Son, fear thou the Lord, and the King: and meddle not with them that are given to change. Prov. 24. 21.
But——whether it be right in the ſight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judg ye? Acts 4. 19.

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be Sold by *Tho. Fabian* at the Bible in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard, 1674.

Benjamin Grantham

His Booke

1684

To all the Baptized Believers in *England*, &c. Grace and Peace through Christ our Lord be multiplied.

THE great Apoſtle St. Paul, having taught the Chriſtian Churches in Creet their Duties towards God, and towards Cæſar; and leaving Titus (a Meſſenger of the Churches) behind him there, very ſtrictly warns him to put them in mind of their Subjection to Principalities, and Powers, and to obey Magiſtrates. Knowing how impoſſible it would be to propagate the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, if Chriſtians did not adorn their Profeſſion with a meek and harmleſs Converſation towards all Men, and eſpecially by their Obedience to thoſe in Authority.

And conſidering the manifold Temptations that attend Chriſtians in theſe days upon that account, I thought it my Duty, as one that has obtained Mercy to be faithful, to do my beſt in giving warning to my Brethren, leſt any of them ſhould be enſnared with ill Principles, or ſpecious Pretences, to ſpeak or do any thing that may be inconſiſtent with Goſpel-Rules, either in things relating more immediately to Almighty God, or to the King's Majeſty, and thoſe that are in Authority under him.

Such

Such heady Perſons there were in the Apoſtle's Days, and therefore the leſs ſtrange if now ſome ſuch be found in the beſt of Churches, as are not afraid to ſpeak Evil of Dignities: All Ages and ſorts of Chriſtians have been troubled with ſuch Evil-Workers. And as it hath been the care of faithful Men all along to proteſt againſt them, that the Truth (which ſuch Wretches only prophane by their Profeſſion of it) might not be worſe thought of becauſe of them; So let it be our care to bear a faithful Teſtimony againſt all ſuch in theſe Days.

And I beſeech you Brethren, whom God hath made as Guides to the reſt, that you give all diligence to teach and inſtruct thoſe under your Charge, in the Duties which pertain to every ſtate of Life; as well as in things which pertain to the Worſhip of our Gracious God: For theſe are the things which become ſound Doctrine, *and of theſe our Obedience to Magiſtrates is not the leaſt. I commit the enſuing Diſcourſes to the Conſideration of all Chriſtians, and to the Bleſſing of God, and remain,*

Your Brother,

and Servant in the Goſpel,

THO. GRANTHAM.

The

The Loyal Baptist:

OR AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

BAPTIZED BELIEVERS.

BEING ALSO

An Earneſt Perſuaſive to them all, to ſtudy to be Quiet, and to do their own Buſineſs, in theſe important Particulars,

VIZ.
I. *To Honour all Men.*
II. *To Love the Brotherhood.*
III. *To Fear God.*
IV. *To Honour the King.*

Delivered in ſeveral Diſcourſes upon 1 *Pet.* 2.17.

Honour all Men, Love the Brotherhood, Fear God, Honour the King.

THis great Apoſtle, St. *Peter*, having preached Chriſt in many Countries, thought it meet to leave ſome Monuments of his holy Doctrine with all the Churches. And having in two ſacred Epiſtles aſſured them of the certainty of the Doctrine which he had preached, and that it was no Fable or new Device, but the very Truth which from the Beginning God made known to his Prophets: He then exhorts them to

Stedfastness, and to hope to the end for the grace or fulness of Glory, which shall be brought to all true Christians at the revelation or second coming of Christ.

He warns them to beware of Sin, chiefly that root of Malice, Envy and Hypocrisy, (for these are usually complicated in one): for as it gave being to all our Misery, and has been all along the ruine of Nations, Churches, and Communities; so we are advertised that it will abound towards the end of the World.

To avoid this damning Iniquity, we are willed to consider our new Birth, and as new-born Babes to evidence our delight to be in the sincere Milk of the Word of God, not in the Vanities of this World, where we are but Pilgrims and Strangers; assuring us, that as Christ is the sure Foundation to support his Church: So, (however some Builders do set him at naught) he is the Head of the Corner, and will certainly in time confound the Disobedient, 1 *Pet.* 2. 7, 8.

Howbeit, lest Christians should be too impatient of the seeming delay of Christ's Exaltation, and of the manifold Tribulations which in the mean time they must suffer; he further warns them to be of an obedient and submissive Spirit to such as are in Authority, and to adorn their Profession, by an honest Conversation, as the best way to silence their Opposers; *For so is the Will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish Men*, 1 Pet. 2. 15. For tho it be very true that all Christians are the Lord's Freemen, 1 *Cor.* 7. 22. yet they may not maliciously despise any Man, nor dishonour any Man, much less any that are in Authority: Christianity being indeed the greatest Obligation that any Man can be under, to preserve and chearfully to give to all their Dues, in respect of Love, Honour, Fear, Tribute, Custom, *&c.* God is to have the things which are God's, Princes the things which are theirs, and all Men (as well those that are not Christians as those that are) must have that Love and Honour which is their Due even from the Servants of Christ.

Thus then we approach the Text; which calls upon us to *Honour all Men, Love the Brotherhood*, to *Fear God*, and to *Honour the King*. In which Directions is briefly contained the whole duty of a Christian Man. As,

1. His

1. His Duty in general to Mankind, *Honour all Men.*
2. His particular Duty to the Church of God, *Love the Brotherhood.*
3. His ſpecial Duty to Almighty God, *Fear God.*
4. His Obedience to the Higher Powers, *Honour the King.*

In opening theſe Words, we ſhall conſider the genuine import of them.

1. *Honour all Men.* (1.) The Word *Honour* here, according to the Greek, may be underſtood thus, *Eſteem all Men highly, value all Men at an high Price, or count them precious:* And hence, *Tremelius* reads the place *Omnem Hominem in Honore habite*, have all Men in high Eſteem or Honour. And in this Direction is implied that lowly and gracious Spirit, that friendly and amicable Temper which all Chriſtians ſhould have and evidence towards Mankind: for he that is not of a lowly Spirit, cannot Honour all Men. (2.) By *All Men*, we muſt not here admit of the exception of any Man as ſuch; but foraſmuch as they are all the Off-ſpring of God, it is the Will of God that a due eſteem be given to them all, as the moſt noble part of his Creation under the Sun; —*And but a little lower than the Angels*, Pſal. 8.

2. *Love the Brotherhood.* By Love here we may ſafely underſtand, a more ſpecial kind of Love than that which we owe to all Men, which is well expreſſed, in the 2 *Epiſt. of John*, *Whom I love in the Truth, for the Truths ſake which dwelleth in us.* Hence ſome of our Tranſlators render the Words thus, *Love Brotherly Fellowſhip.* And the Rhemiſts tells us, that *This Speech often commendeth the Unity of all Chriſtians among themſelves.*

3. *Fear God.* The Original imports an awful dread, or ſuch a Fear as cauſeth Trembling; and 'tis the ſame Word uſed, *Mat.* 10. 28. where it is evident ſuch a Fear is intended: *But rather fear him which is able to deſtroy both Soul and Body in Hell.* By the Fear of God therefore in this place, we muſt underſtand the dutiful Obſervance of his revealed Will (for ſo the Fear of God is ſometimes taken) as ever we expect to ſee his Face with Comfort: and here the Fear of Man is excluded, becauſe it brings a Snare, *Prov.* 29. 25. and is a fatal prevention to the Service of God.

4. *Honour the King.* (1.) The Word τιμᾶτε does not barely ſignify Honour, or Eſteem, in this place; but a magnificent or ſplendid kind of Honour: for ſo hath the Lord ordained for his Vicegerents, giving them the Title of Gods in *Pſal.* 82. 6. (2.) It is carefully to be conſidered what *King* is immediately meant in our Text: he could be no King of *Iſrael*, for the Kings of *Iſrael* had failed long before this Epiſtle was written; and tho Chriſt was born King of the *Jews*, yet he did not enter upon his Regality with reſpect to the Government of that, nor any other Nation: but plainly tells us, *His Kingdom is not of this World.* Nor did the Apoſtle ſpeak of any Chriſtian King, for as yet *None of the Princes of this World knew Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 8. The King therefore here immediately intended was an Heathen King, the King of the *Romans*, who at that time (as Hiſtorians relate) was both of very wicked Life, and Idolatrous in his Religion, calling himſelf *Pontifex Maximus*, as being chief about the Worſhip of *Jupiter.* And yet, S. *Peter* will have him honoured even by thoſe who had put themſelves under the Yoak of Chriſt, their Heavenly King. And St. *Paul* expreſly requires the ſame, *Rom.* 13. 1. Wherefore from the Text thus explained, we ſhould learn theſe four things.

I. *That Chriſtians muſt by no means be of an haughty, ſcornful, nor wrathful Spirit towards any Man; but of an humble and gentle Behaviour, to pay the Debt of Honour to all, and to eſteem them precious.*

II. *Brotherly Fellowſhip, Love and Concord, are to be ſought for, and maintained by all Chriſtians, one with another, as ſuch.*

III. *Chriſtians muſt have an awful Fear of God before their Eyes, that in Matters of Religion they may ſerve him only, and not provoke him by ſinful Courſes, nor by the Fear of Man.*

IV. *Chriſtians are bound by Goſpel-Rules to be good Subjects to Princes, to honour their Perſons, and conſciencioufly to obey their Authority.*

Theſe

Theſe Propoſitions do harmonize with the Doctrine which is according to Godlineſs.

For the Firſt; That Chriſtians muſt by no means (as they tender their claim to the venerable Title of *Chriſtian*, and to any part in the Kingdom of Chriſt) be of an haughty, ſcornful or wrathful Spirit againſt any Man, is a Doctrine needful to be proclaimed by an heavenly Herald, by the Voice of an Archangel, even to that part of the World called *Chriſtendom*: For who can ſufficiently bewail the almoſt utter Abſence of this gracious Spirit, which abounded in the Author and firſt Profeſſors of Chriſtianity; and the undeniable Appearance of a Spirit of a quite contrary nature at this day, in all parts of the World where Chriſt is named? From whence come Wars and Fightings? Come they not hence, even from Pride? as it is written, *Prov.* 13. 10. *Only by Pride cometh Contention.* What greater Injuries, Indignities, and Diſhonours can be offered by Mortals one towards another, than are amongſt the ſeveral Orders profeſſing Chriſtianity? yea, very often by Men of the ſame Order, one towards another? So very far are the generality of Chriſtians from obeying the Voice of our Text. And look how far they are gone from the Spirit of Humility and Tenderneſs, which leads all that have it to eſteem Mankind very precious; ſo far they have loſt the Chriſtian Religion, as will appear in proving the firſt Propoſition. To which purpoſe,

1. We ſhall give precendency to our Lord Chriſt, who perceiving an haughty Spirit peeping forth in his choſen Diſciples, even then whilſt the very Mirror of Meekneſs and Humility was before their Eyes, does ſolemnly denounce unto them, (and in them to all Chriſtians) that *except they were converted, and became as little Children, they ſhould by no means enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Luke 18. 15. And therewithal gives notice of a Wo impending or coming upon the World, from that Spirit of Pride and Ambition, in this ſo early an appearance of it, which yet notwithſtanding ſeems to have over-run the Church in all Ages, to the Scandal of Religion. But would ſo ſmall a Fault in the choſen Diſciples, (as it may ſeem, in reſpect of that which is now every where to be found) ſhut Heaven againſt them, unleſs thoſe converted Souls were converted in that Caſe? Let us tremble to think of this.

It's clear from this Inſtance, that ſuch as are of an haughty Mind, cannot honour all Men. They are Bladders puffed up with this Wind; break this Bladder, there is meer Emptineſs. Their Goodneſs vaniſhes, when they cannot lift themſelves above others. Whereas the truly gracious Soul ſtudies how to ſerve God, and all Men for his ſake; and thus to honour them, is the greateſt Reſpect that any Chriſtian can give to Men. Thus did our Lord himſelf honour all: *He took upon him the form of a Servant.* Phil. 2. 7. And indeed his great Deſign in his Life and Doctrine, was to reſtore Mankind to a State of Grace, and Reconciliation with God, and thereby to Amity and Concord one with another.

2. Next to our Saviour, let us hear his beloved Diſciple *John.* He often ſpeaks to the whole Church under the Title of *Little Children*; and the Metaphor is very fit for Chriſtians, as in other reſpects, ſo chiefly in this, to put them in mind, they muſt in no wiſe be of a lofty and wrathful Spirit. He tells us, the Love of God is not in thoſe Men, who have the Pride of Life in them, 1 *John* 2. 15, 16. They cannot honour, eſteem, or count all Men precious, till that Image of Chriſt, which ſtandeth in Humility, be formed in them.

3. The Apoſtle *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 32, 33. does not only teach the Brotherhood, that they muſt *ſhew all Meekneſs to all Men, and give no Offence to Jew nor Gentile*; but puts himſelf (as becomes all true Miniſters of Chriſt) for a Patern to the Flock. *Tho* (ſaith he) *I be free from all Men, yet I have made my ſelf Servant unto all, that I might gain the more.* —— *I am made all Things to all Men, that I might by all means ſave ſome.* 1 Cor. 9. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. How precious did he count the Jewiſh Nation! (tho they generally hated him) he could be content to be undone himſelf, rather than they ſhould be loſt. *Rom.* 10. 1. And no leſs concern'd for the poor Gentiles, that they alſo might be happy. *Rom.* 15. 16. And hitherto did tend the Scope of all his Labours, to *warn, teach*, and to *preſent every Man perfect in Chriſt Jeſus.* Col. 1. 28.

4. And foraſmuch as the Tongue is the ordinary Witneſs of the Spirit of Pride, and that whereby all Men are incident to diſhonour one another, he ſtrictly obligeth all Chriſtians to *let their Speech be always with Grace, ſeaſoned with Salt, that they may adminiſter Grace to them that hear them.* Col. 4. 6. And he that will obey our Text, to *honour* all Men, muſt remember *that he ſpeak evil of no Man*, (an Impiety which God knows even reigns amongſt Chriſtians.)

Christians.) *The Tongue is an unruly Member, a World of Iniquity.* And hence the Apostle *James* is very bold, telling us, our Religion is vain, if we bridle not that Member. *Jam.* 3. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. How can that Tongue be fit to bless God, to profess the Christian Religion, which is exercised in cursing, speaking evil, or wishing ill to any Man? *My Brethren, these Things ought not to be. Doth a Fountain give sweet Water and bitter at the same place?* This is not to be found in Nature, nor to be expected in Grace. Christians must be known to all Men by their Fruits of Righteousness, Meekness, Goodness, and Faith; otherwise Men shall never be moved to glorify God in their behalf.

5. That Christian who will honour all Men, must love all Men; without this, he cannot esteem them, nor count them precious. Whom we love not, we have no delight to honour. It is in a manner peculiar to the Christian Doctrine, that Men should love their Enemies, pray for them that persecute them and despitefully use them. Let us therefore pay this Debt, to honour all Men in Love. He that will do this, must bear Mankind upon his Heart in Prayer and Supplication. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. This is a Lesson for Christians, as such, they must love their Neighbours as themselves, and all Men are their Neighbours. The Royal Law obliges them to it; *Jam.* 2. 8. *If ye fulfill the Royal Law according to the Scriptures, Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self, ye do well; but if ye have respect to Persons,* (that is, love one, and hate another) *ye commit Sin, and are convinced of the Law as Transgressors.* Were Christians filled more with this Fruit of the Spirit, we should see an end of these Animosities, opprobrious and abusive Epithets, or Brands of Reproach and Infamy, which are daily cast upon Men, and too frequently found among Christian Men. It is to be lamented, that Men who are precious in the esteem of God, should not be esteemed so by one another.

But *honour all Men*, says our Text; and the Arguments to enforce the Duty are many, of which, some we will urge in this place, and the first shall be this:

First; They are Men as well as our selves, our Equals by Creation, the Workmanship of the Hands of the same God; and therefore are we bound to honour all Men, as Men; nor can we slight, despise, or dishonour them, but we dishonour our selves:

For

For they are Fleſh of our Fleſh, and *God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, to dwell upon the Face of the Earth*; and he is the *God of the Spirits of all Fleſh.* And thus we have all one Father; as one God hath created us, *we are all his Off-ſpring:* not as ſome prophanely have ſaid, that Man is no more God's Off-ſpring than an Hog; for he did not conſult the Creation of any thing, as he did the Creation of Man, *Gen.* 2. Nor did he breath into the Noſtrils of Hogs, the ſame Spirit of Life and Wiſdom which he breathed into Man. *David* admires the Goodneſs of God in the dignified State of Man, *Pſal.* 8. 4, 5. And let us beware of baſe thoughts concerning Man, leſt we value him no more than the Beaſts of the Field, and ſo diſhonour him, whom God created in great Honour, and to this day (notwithſtanding his Fall) hath ſet him over the Works of his Hands. All Men are our Brethren, let us honour them as ſuch; for what Brotherhood ſoever we attain, yet our humane Fraternity is antecedent, and not made void by any *Poſt*-Fraternity, which is good, but rather more indeared. This was ſeen in St. *Paul*, the nearer his Relation was to God upon the account of Chriſtianity, the more was his Love, and the greater his Sorrow for his Brethren according to the Fleſh, *Rom.* 9. 2. Let not Chriſtians think, that their Relation, nor Obligation of Nature to Mankind, is deſtroyed or made leſs, by their being Chriſtians; ſuch a vain Conceit will alienate us from our own Fleſh, and make us quite pervert the Text, which puts us in mind that our Religion does ſtrongly engage us to honour them all. It was a Vertue in the *Philoſopher*, who would not be accounted of this or that Nation, Tribe, or City, but entitled himſelf a *Citizen of the whole World*; meaning, he had an equal reſpect for Mankind; and if his Relation might be an Honour, he would be related to them all, that he might honour them all.

Secondly; Chriſtians muſt honour all Men, becauſe God himſelf hath honoured them all, ſetting his Love upon them, and manifeſting it to them, and that divers ways: As,

1. In the common Acts of his Providence, of which we have an excellent Account in the 107*th* Pſalm, to which I refer you. It is he that giveth them fruitful Seaſons, filling their Hearts with Joy and Gladneſs; he gives them Life and Breath, and all things. Hence they (even all Nations) are called his People, and the *Sheep of his Paſture*, Pſal. 100. 1, 2. and upon this very ground are

are required to pay their Debt of Thankfulneſs unto him.

2. God has greatly honoured Mankind in the gracious Act of Redemption; I ſay, in this he has greatly *eſteemed all Men, and counted them very precious.* That God hath done this for *all Men*, nothing can be more plain than theſe Teſtimonies: *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, who gave himſelf a Ranſom for all.* 1 Tim. 2. 6. *We ſee Jeſus made a little lower than the Angels, for the ſuffering of Death.* —— *That he by the Grace of God ſhould taſte Death for every Man.* Heb. 2. 9. *For all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the Glory of God, being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Rom. 3. 23, 24. *He is a Propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but alſo for the Sins of the whole World.* Surely he that againſt the Light of theſe plain Teſtimonies, can or will think that God neglected the greateſt part, or any part of Mankind, in the moſt important Buſineſs of Redemption, muſt needs have a very low eſteem and diſhonourable thoughts of that part of Mankind, cannot value them much above the fallen Angels or Devils, for whom no Ranſom was given; and conſequently they cannot *honour all Men.* The Devils are but Sinners, ſhut up to the Judgment of Eternal Fire, without means of Recovery; and theſe Men, that narrow up the Redemption of Man to the Elect only, ſhut up the remainder of Men in that Condemnation which is inevitable. And what Honour can belong to ſuch? How ſhould we count them precious, if indeed God hated them from all Eternity? It is not ſaying, *That we know them not by Name, and therefore ought to honour all Men*, that will ſalve the Buſineſs: For the truth is, if we heartily honour all Men, we muſt be *ſure* that God would have us do ſo; and of this we cannot be ſure, if we think God made them only to damn them: For if the Eſteem or Honour which we give to all Men, proceed not from ſincere Love to them, and Deſire of their Happineſs, it is but Hypocriſy, no true Honour; for the Honour which we owe to all Men, is not founded upon any thing wherein they are dignified above us, but upon thoſe Bleſſings or Favours from God, which are common to us all, and wherein he has made no difference between one and another. And therefore if we truly eſteem, love, and wiſh all Men well in the Caſe of their Salvation, we muſt believe that God does ſo too, or elſe we cannot do it heartily. *Auguſtine*'s Speech here is worthy of Remembrance; *O vehement Love! that God for Man's cauſe can vouchſafe to become*

Man! Who can hate Man, whoſe Nature and Likeneſs he beholds in the Humanity of God? Surely, if God has not loved all Men in Chriſt, we have no cauſe to count them precious, becauſe we ſee them not favoured in the Humanity of God.

3. That our God counts *all Men* precious, may be ſeen in the Order given, that the Word of Peace or Reconciliation may be preached to *all Men*, or, to every Creature; to be *made known to all Nations for the Obedience of Faith.* Mat. 28. 19. Rom. 16. 26. Surely this Meſſage, with the Meſſenger and Meſſengers that brought it to *all Men*, does ſtupendouſly evidence, how precious God accounts all Men. He may juſtly demand, What could have been done to evidence my Love to Man, and the precious Eſteem I have of him, which I have not done. Has he not ſent his Apoſtles, whoſe Words have gone to the *uttermoſt parts of the Earth? Rom.* 10. Yea, he hath ſent his Son, whom he hath made Heir of all Things; yea, he hath ſent thus to thoſe that would not accept theſe Tokens of Love, Eſtimation, or Honour. *John* 1. 11. *Mat.* 21. 38. Surely it is an Act of Honour towards the Party viſited, when the King comes to viſit the Beggar, yea, the Traytor. *Whence is this to me,* ſaid *Elizabeth, that the Mother of my Lord ſhould come to me?* And whence is this to Man, or what Honour hath God conferred upon Man, that our Lord himſelf ſhould come to Man, to redeem him by the Death of the Croſs, and to make all Men ſee what is the Fellowſhip of this myſterious Piece of Godlineſs, (*which is God manifeſt in the Fleſh,* &c.) by the Light of the Goſpel?

Thirdly; *Chriſtians muſt honour all Men, becauſe this is one effectual way to recommend the Way of Chriſtianity, or the Truth which we profeſs, to the acceptance of all Men.* And hitherto may be referred theſe and the like Rules; *Walk in Wiſdom towards them that are without. If you ſalute your Brethren only, what do you more than others? The Servant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive, but be gentle towards all Men. Render to no Man Evil for Evil, but overcome Evil with Good. Shewing all Meekneſs to all Men. Giving a Reaſon of the Hope that is in you, with Meekneſs and Fear.* That Chriſtian that ſhall walk towards all Men according to theſe Rules, ſhall certainly honour all Men, and greatly recommend the Truth to them all; for thus ſhall he himſelf become an Epiſtle of Chriſt, *read and known of all Men.* 1 Cor. 3. 2.

I ſhall conclude this firſt Doctrine with a ſolemn Proteſtation againſt all ſuch as would ſet up their Religion by Violence, Blood, and Treachery, by what Name ſoever diſtinguiſhed; for if this be their Scope, they have not known Chriſt, nor the Divine Power of Chriſtianity. *Cain* leads the Van to this unreaſonable Troop, who never did nor can *honour all Men*, till they be delivered from this Principle: No, they deſire to kill, that they only might be honoured. By this unchriſtian ſort of Chriſtians, what unſpeakable Butcheries have been committed! Hundreds of Thouſands in a neighbouring Nation, in this Age, cruelly deſtroyed. What Hangings, Burnings, and Tormentings all *Europe* over! And this pretendedly to advance Holy Church! As if our Saviour's Houſe muſt be built with Blood, when yet he plainly tells us, he came not to kill Men, but to ſave them, and ſharply rebukes his Diſciples, when ſuch a Spirit appeared in them.

And have we not ſeen a refined Generation, (as they would be thought) peeping forth, with the Name of Blood, or the *ſmiting Principle*, written on their Forehead, with direction to their Proſelites to pray, that God would deſtroy all Oppreſſion and *Oppreſſors* from off the face of the Earth? Lord! what is this? The greateſt part of Mankind peradventure are Oppreſſors in one thing or other; and muſt a Chriſtian pray for their Deſtruction, or for their Converſion? Sure the latter is the Duty of all Chriſtians. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. They cannot deſire ſuch a woful Day, but that Mercy may be extended, knowing that themſelves were *ſometimes fooliſh, diſobedient, living in Malice, hateful, and hating one another.* Tit. 3. But alas! do not theſe Men pray for their own Deſtruction? Who ſees not that ſuch a Principle is pregnant with Oppreſſion? O let all Chriſtians beware of it. And let us *pray for them that hate us, perſecute us, and ſpeak all manner of Evil againſt us falſly, for his Names ſake, who hath called us not only to believe, but alſo to ſuffer for his ſake.*

Thus leaving all Men of bloody, violent, and treacherous Principles, to conſider what Spirit they are of; how unlike our Lord Chriſt; how different from the Primitive Chriſtians; how contrary to Humanity it ſelf, which teaches all to do to others (not as they do) but as we would they ſhould do to us: We ſhall

proceed to the next Point of Doctrine, grounded upon the ſecond Direction in the Text, *Love the Brotherhood.*

Doct. II. *Brotherly Fellowſhip, Love and Unity is carefully to be endeavoured and maintained by all Chriſtians.*

This Brotherhood being not natural, but ſpiritual and myſtical, admits of a twofold Conſideration:

1. In the largeſt Sence the Word (and Uſe of it in Scripture) will bear.
2. In a more ſtrict and ſpecial Sence.

In the firſt, we muſt comprehend all that own the holy Scriptures for the Rule of Faith, believing in the only true God, the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, (*for theſe three are one*); that Chriſt died for our Sins, and roſe again for our Juſtification; that live ſoberly, according to the general Rules of Chriſtianity, tho they may be diverſly perſuaded in the Methods of Chriſtian Worſhip. Or I could be content, (if the State of Chriſtianity would bear it in theſe Days) to expreſs my ſelf in this Caſe in the Words of St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. 1. 2. *All that in every place call upon the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; among whom he found Diverſities of Opinions, as well as Diſorders in practice of Ordinances. Not that he allows either, but labours to reform both, yet ſo as he would preſerve Amity among them as they were Brethren, tho ſome of them were carnal, 1 *Cor.* 3. others allowing themſelves a very dangerous Liberty in religious Matters, even to eat Things ſacrificed to Idols; ſome doubting of the Reſurrection, others very looſe in their Devotion at the Lord's Table; they were ſome tumultuous, others otherwiſe vicious, 2 *Cor.* 13. Now whether the Apoſtle, in his Exhortations to Unity, intends, that notwithſtanding theſe Errors they ſhould hold ample Communion with the Erroneous; or whether, upon adhering to Reproof by him given, and their obeying the Epiſtles which he ſent to them, he obliges them to maintain and uphold their Communion, is the Buſineſs to be conſidered.

The firſt it is not like to be, for then few Errors, either in Doctrine or Life, could break this brotherly Fellowſhip among Chriſtians. And then to what purpoſe are theſe Rules given? *Mark*

them

them which cauſe Diviſions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. Rom. 16. 17. *Withdraw your ſelves from every Brother which walks diſorderly,* &c. 2 Theſſ. 3. 6. Surely all that can be required, as to Unity with theſe Chriſtians, is a brotherly Compaſſion, to encourage what we can the Truth they hold, or the Good they do; to hold with them in the common Cauſe of Chriſtianity, againſt the common Enemy of it. I conceive the latter to be the only ſafe way, *viz.* That notwithſtanding their great Carnality, Weakneſs of Judgment, or Frowardneſs in their erroneous Opinions, *&c.* if now they would receive the Counſel of the Lord's Meſſenger, or which the Lord by his Meſſenger had ſent unto them, that then the Brotherhood once found among them ſhould ſtill continue, tho they had too evidently forfeited their Privileges. Thus to take the Apoſtle's meaning, is to make him harmonize with himſelf. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. *If any Man obey not our Word by this Epiſtle, note that Man, and have no Company with him, that he may be aſhamed; yet count him not an Enemy, but admoniſh him as a Brother.* But to take the Apoſtle in the firſt Sence, would make him irreconcileable to or with himſelf. So then, *Paul* did not adviſe the Faithful at *Corinth*, to hold ample Communion with thoſe of ill Life, and erroneous Principles in the neceſſary parts of Religion, ſuch as the Reſurrection, and Separation from Idolatry doubtleſs are; for he that denies the firſt, *denies Chriſt to be riſen, makes the Apoſtles falſe Witneſſes, and the Faith of Chriſtians vain.* 1 *Cor.* 15. 1,2,3. And the ſecond makes Men uncapable to ſerve God: *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Idols (or Devils.)* 1 *Cor.* 1. 10.

Let us then conſider the ſecond, or more ſtrict Sence of the Word, *Brotherhood*, in our Text. And here we muſt take it, as it pertains to truly conſtituted and well-governed Societies of *Chriſtians*: For undoubtedly God intended to have the Chriſtian Religion ſtated and maintained in all Nations, according to the priſtine Simplicity of the Goſpel, without the mixtures of Legal Ceremonies, or humane Innovations: For when Jeſus gave commiſſion to his Apoſtles, to *teach all Nations, baptizing them*; and then, *to teach them to obſerve all Things whatſoever he commanded them.* Mat. 28. 19, 20. and gave being to this Order, to continue to the end of the World, it muſt needs be highly rational on the part of all ſuch, as do piouſly ſtand to this Form of Doctrine, as expli-

explicated and delivered to the Churches, *Rom.* 6. 17. *Heb.*6. 1,2. And conſequently it muſt needs be very pleaſing to God, and commendable in the Church, that his Inſtitutes be kept with the greateſt exactneſs, *as they were delivered at firſt*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 2.

For if once Variations in either the Doctrinal or Practical Parts of the Chriſtian Religion be admitted, there can be no certain duration of any Truth. *A little Leaven leaveneth the whole Lump*, Gal. 5. 7. And this the Apoſtle ſpeaks too, with relation to the Impoſition of ſome Legal Rites, which once had a Divine Original and Uſe in the Church of God, and yet now could not conſiſt with obedience to the Truth. Gal. 5. 7. *Ye did run well, who did hinder you, that you ſhould not obey the Truth?* Hence Saint *Paul* would not give place to St. *Peter* himſelf, (when too much ſymbolizing with legal Ceremonies, *Gal.* 2.) that ſo the Truth of the Goſpel might continue in the Churches of *Galatia*; plainly ſhewing, that as Light and Darkneſs cannot dwell together, ſo the Goſpel is excluſive of legal Ceremonies and humane Innovations. And ſeeing all muſt grant, there has been a very great departure from the Truth of the Goſpel, both in Doctrine and Practice, there cannot be a better Method (I ſuppoſe) thought on, to amend what is amiſs in the Chriſtian World, (*and thereby to reſtore true brotherly Fellowſhip*) than that uſed by our Lord, *Mat.* 19. 8. to reform a Corruption among the Jews, and ſuch an Error too as had a ſhew of Scripture-Authority for it, (I mean the Caſe of *Divorce*) yet our Saviour ſuppreſſeth that Cuſtom, by referring to the primitive Inſtitution of Marriage; *From the Beginning it was not ſo.*

And upon this Text, how well does our Brethren (I mean the Sober and Pious in the Church of *England*) defend themſelves againſt Popiſh Innovations, both in Opinion and Practice? One of them ſpeaks thus: As touching *each of theſe Errors*, we can ſay with our Saviour, in this preſent Correption of the Phariſees, that *from the Beginning it was not ſo*; and we care not whence they come, unleſs they come from the Beginning. This hath ever been (ſaith he) the Rule, the warrantable Rule to reform a Church. When *Eſdras* was intent on building the Temple, he ſent not to *Epheſus*, much leſs to *Rome*; he did not enquire into the Rituals of *Numa Pompilius*; but had recourſe for a *Temple*, to that of *Solomon*; and for a *Rite*, to that of *Moſes*. Indeed for Things meerly indifferent, (as he obſerves) there muſt be preſerved

ſerved a Liberty in all Churches to conſult and do for the beſt. I dare not ſay as he, *To make Conſtitutions*; (for that's a great word) but to manage her Affairs with Decency, Order, and Charity.

But to come more directly to our Doctrine, which is, *Brotherly Fellowſhip; Love and Unity is carefully to be endeavoured and maintained by all Chriſtians.*

Certain it is that our Love, as Chriſtians, may go much further than our actual Communion in all things Chriſtian, may do; and yet this Love it ſelf is a kind of Fellowſhip. The Angels have Fellowſhip with us, and acknowledg themſelves our *Fellow Servants*, *Rev.* 19. 10. and yet they do not partake with us in all our acts of Religion, but only by approbation and corroboration, in things which are well done. Now the beſt or moſt orderly ſort of Chriſtians cannot conceive a greater diſproportion between their Churches, and the Churches of the moſt erring (if but well-meaning) Societies that conſcientiouſly profeſs Love and Obedience to Chriſt: And even hence, we are obliged to hold as much Brotherly Fellowſhip with them, as we can, eſpecially that of Love and Brotherly Compaſſion. For when we conſider, that even ſome of all ſorts of Chriſtians will rather dye, than baſely deny their Lord and Maſter, we cannot but have Fellowſhip with ſuch in our Spirits, whilſt it is the ſame (and not a feigned Chriſt) to whom they ſhew their utmoſt teſtimony of Love.

And this Conſideration alone, may ſuffice to take away that imbitteredneſs, which is too often found among Chriſtians diſſenting one from another: Let their Appellations be what they will, ſo that they believe in the true Chriſt, and live well, being alſo faithful to what they know. And tho they be never ſo angry with me for oppoſing them in their Traditions, or erring Notions otherwiſe, yet I muſt have a Brotherly tenderneſs towards them all for the Truths ſake which dwelleth in them. But now, for ample or full Communion, I ſee not how that can be attained and maintained, but where there is antecedent to it, an Union both in Doctrine and Practice, in things neceſſary to the true Conſtitution and Government of the Church of Chriſt. And ſeeing alſo our Differences about theſe things are not ſmall, or trivial; it cannot (I think) be better ordered, than that a Friendly Diſtinction, and Brotherly Forbearance be permitted as to ample Communion; for that

that Men cannot comfortably nor peaceably join together till they be agreed in these things.

I see not that the difference betwixt *Paul* and *Barnabas* was so great (as to the thing about which they differed) as the things about which Christians differ in these days; and yet its certain their Contention being great (for παροξυσμὸς signifies *provoking, gauling, and imbittered Speeches, and Minds*, say the Learned) it is certain they could not transact their Affairs in the Gospel together, but apart. And this was written perhaps to shew, that a competent Unity in Judgment must precede our actual Communion, and till that be attained among us, there is a necessity (in regard, partly of human Frailty, and partly in regard of some precious Truths) to forbear one another, without destroying the Truth to which we have attained respectively.

And this is the greatest Love we can extend to one another, under these difficult Circumstances.

1. To pity and heartily to pray one for another; for the Servant of the Lord must not strive but be gentle towards all Men, in Meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.

2. There must be all Patience exercised, and Compassion shewed to the Ignorant, and those that are out of the way, especially where the scruple is tender and conscientious. And in the mean time, the faithful Minister of God must *hold fast the form of sound Words*, he must teach the *same Doctrine which was committed to his Trust by the Apostles.* He must *warn others that they teach no other Doctrine.* He must *not give place to Jewish, or other Fables.* And the Church must so walk in Christ, *as they first received him*, rooted in the Foundation-Principles, established and built up in him: *Not carried about with every Wind of Doctrine*, but *speaking the Truth in Love, must endeavour to grow up into Christ in all things.* In a word, it is the Duty of this Brotherhood to stick close to the *whole Councel of God*, and not to *partake with other Mens Sins*, or Errors in Life or Religion; which cannot be done, where contrarieties in Doctrine and Practice about things necessary to the true State and Government of the Church of Christ, are allowed in the same Fellowship or Community.

Love the Brotherhood. This Fraternity are in a special manner to love one another.

1. Be-

1. Becauſe God himſelf hath loved them with a ſpecial kind of Love: *And if God ſo loved us, we ought alſo to love one another*, 1 John 3. It is happy when the Love of Chriſtians is founded upon this bottom, *viz.* the Manifeſtation of God's Love to them, and not upon any thing of human Excellency; for this is *to have Mens Perſons in Admiration*, and not to admire this, *Behold what manner of Love the Father hath beſtowed upon us!*

2. Becauſe this is the ſweeteſt Manifeſtation, that we are the Children of God; for *in this is manifeſt the Children of God*, 1 John 3.10. namely, that they love their Brethren: *And every one that loveth, is born of God.* And our Saviour makes it the true Character of Chriſtianity: *By this ſhall all Men know that ye are my Diſciples, if ye love one another*, Joh. 13. 35.

3. Becauſe this is the uniting Grace among Chriſtians, this makes their Society ſweet, their Fellowſhip deſirable, its a *Fellowſhip of Love*, *Phil.* 2. 1. This makes them like *David* and *Jonathan*, they are bound in one Girdle, and their Love was wonderful.

4. Becauſe this makes the Sufferings of Chriſtians eaſy; when thoſe that ſuffer love them, in defence of whoſe Faith they do ſuffer; and ſee themſelves beloved of their Brethren, even then when all Men ſeem to hate them. This made *Paul* himſelf rejoice in his Sufferings, Phil. 4. 10, 14. *I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the laſt your care of me hath flouriſhed again, — Ye have well done that ye have communicated with me in my Affliction.*

Let us touch the things briefly, which may be ſure Evidences of this Brotherly Love.

1. If then we love the Brotherhood, we are much concern'd about them in our Thoughts. For what is the Object of a Man's Love, is the Subject of his Meditation. All true Lovers know this by Experience; and let the Love of the Brotherhood exceed our Love in other caſes. An inſtance of this Love we have in St. *Paul*, Col. 2. 1, 2. *For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them of Laodicea, and for as many as have not ſeen my Face in the Fleſh: That their Hearts might be comforted, being knit together in Love*, &c.

2. If we love our Brethren, we bear them much upon our Heart in our Prayers; we cannot forget them if we rightly love them. *Paul made mention of him in every Prayer of his whom he dearly loved*, 2 Tim. 1. 3. Let all Chriſtian Brethren do ſo too, for we cannot

do leſs for any of them, or for many of them we can do no more.

3. If we love the Brotherhood, we will eſteem them highly, according to the Vertues which we ſee in them, 2 *John v.* 1,2,3. And whom we love we will commend, and advance as much as we can, becauſe it's the native Property of Love to do ſo; as appears in the interchanges of Love in the Song of *Solomon*, between Chriſt and his Church: and is the way too, to encreaſe Love, as all Experience ſhews.

4. If we love our Brethren, we will to our beſt defend their Reputation againſt thoſe that injure them. Thus *Paul* vindicated not himſelf only, but thoſe faithful Miniſters which were with him, when ſome reported of them that they *walked after the Fleſh*, and ſaid, *Let us do Evil that good may come*; whoſe *Damnation*, for ſuch vile Reproaches againſt the Servants of Chriſt, *he avers to be juſt.*

5. If we love the Brotherhood, we will to our Power relieve their Neceſſities. For *He that hath this Worlds Good, and ſees his Brother want, and ſhutteth up the Bowels of his Compaſſion, how dwells the Love of God in him?* And ſaith another Apoſtle, *If a Brother or Siſter be deſtitute of daily Food, and ye ſay, Be ye filled, and give them not thoſe things that are neceſſary*, what doth it profit? Wherefore let Love be without Diſſimulation. Let it be fervent. For to this end were *our Souls purified in obeying the Truth through the Spirit*, even *unto unfeigned Love of the Brethren*, 1 Pet. 1.22.

6. The laſt Evidence. If we love the Brotherhood, we will ſeek and preſerve as much as we can, the Peace of the whole, and the Proſperity of every part. *Pray for the Peace of* Jeruſalem (ſaith David) *they ſhall proſper that love thee; for my Brethren and Companions ſake I will now ſay, Peace be within thy Walls, and Proſperity within thy Palaces.* How greatly does the true Son of *David*, our Lord Jeſus, pray for this Bleſſing upon the whole Church, *That they all may be one, as he and his Father are one?* And what Chriſtian will not tremble to think of doing any thing againſt the tenour of his bleſſed Prayer?

I will conclude this point with a ſolemn Proteſtation againſt thoſe Evils which chiefly hinder the love of the Brotherhood; and the firſt is Pride.

1. On-

1. Only *through Pride cometh Contention* (saith the Spirit); when Men are admirers of themselves, Proud, Boasters; they soon become despisers of those that are good, and Enemies to the Love of the Brotherhood. *Diotrephes* being got to this point, presently makes havock of the Church, by casting the Brethren out of the Church that shewed their brotherly Love to the travelling Ministers. And why? because he loved to have the Preheminence, insomuch as he spared not to undervalue the Apostle himself. *A proud Professor cannot love the Brotherhood.*

2. As all proud Men are Enemies to brotherly Love; so most of all such as take themselves to be infallible about things most disputable, being vainly confident that God is opposed when their Impositions are not obeyed. These Men commonly drive furiously, rend and tear, if their Mandates meet with dislike or non-reception. These Men will ever stand strenuously upon Niceties, and make things which are doubtful, and meerly indifferent, to become necessary.

3. Those who make Gain their Godliness, are great Enemies to Brotherly Love, these are called *greedy Dogs* by the Prophet, *greedy Wolves* by the Apostle; these seek their own, not the things of Christ. They are Enemies to him; their God is their Belly, they mind earthly things; they change with every Wind for Preferment. They are Lovers of their own selves. They teach things which they ought not, for filthy Lucres sake. They love not the Brotherhood, but their Money.

Thus much to the second Point. We come now to the third part of our Text.

Fear God.

Hence the Doctrine has been propounded thus.

Doct. III. *Christians must have an awful Fear of God before their Eyes, that in Matters of Religion they may serve him only, and not provoke him by sinful Courses, nor by the Fear of Man.*

To come rightly to the performance of this Duty, we must endeavour to have a right knowledg or Belief of this God whom we

are to fear, for this our Saviour makes to be the *weighty* part of our Religion, *Faith, and the Fear of God.* Now in this Faith, which anteceeds the Fear, Worſhip, and Service of God, we muſt conſider the Eſſence and Attributes of God. In the firſt, he is infinitely beyond the reach of our knowledg, or finding out unto Perfection. Job 4. 24. *It is but a ſmall portion that we know (or can know) of him in this World.*

Faith therefore ſatisfies it ſelf, with knowing that *Pſal.* 90. 2. *God is:* or, that *there is one God.* That he is a Spirit *Rev.* 4. 10. Eternal, Pure, Omnipotent, Immutable, Inviſible, 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. Merciful, Faithful, Holy, Juſt and Good; and that *Pſal.* 147. 5. he is infinitely and perfectly ſo, and whatſoever elſe *Prov.* 15. 3. may be ſaid to repreſent him Great and Glorious; Great in his Sovereignty and Dominion, Glorious in his doings towards the Children of Men. In a Word, *Faith* apprehends or believes this God to be, whatſoever his Word declares him to be, which together with his works of Creation and Providence are the Intelligencers to Mortals, his good Spirit alſo helping and illuminating all that heartily ſeek after him. Howbeit this Faith is not of the ſame magnitude in all that have it, but 'tis of the ſame Nature, — *To all that have obtained like precious Faith with us, through the Righteouſneſs of God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, 2 Pet. 1. 1.

To fear God, is indeed a Duty incumbent upon all Men, and not upon Chriſtians only. And for the better performance of this great Duty, it is good to know the Cauſe, why Mankind of all other Creatures is bound to fear God; I ſay, Mankind only, of all ſublunary Creatures: for from other Creatures God expects not this, nor do they pay it to him, not having capacity, and ſo no neceſſity on them to do it. But they are ſubjugated to the Fear of Man, who is placed over them as Supream, *Pſal.* 86. 7, 8. *Gen.* 9. 2. Indeed I do not find that this Fear and Dread of Man, was upon the Creatures below him, till after the Earth was accurſed. It is true a Dominion was given Man over them in his innocent Eſtate, *Gen.* 1. 28. But that he ſhould have ruled them with Rigour, as now, I find not, but do conceive that the terrour of Man to the brute Creatures, and their Diſobedience to him, are Effects of the Curſe; and its certain the Curſe was the Effect of Sin. But in theſe things let us not be too curious.

Now

Now whether in case Man had not sinned, he should have been obliged to fear God as now, or whether he should have properly feared God at all, may be enquired here? To which it may be answered, That seeing God had endued Man with excellent Reason and Judgment, and yet put him in a mutable State, and gave him notice that his state was such, when he gave him a Law with a Penalty upon the Breach of it. In the Breach of which *he should surely dye*, *Gen.* 2. 17. It follows that Man was even then bound to Fear, and to stand in awe of his Majesty from the beginning before Sin was upon him. So that Sin is not the Original Cause of the Fear of God, but his Bounty towards Man, and absolute Sovereignty over him, are the Grounds of it. And hence we may learn, how just, how necessary it is for us who are of the fall'n race of *Adam*, not only for that we are under these Original Obligations, and for that the Covenant which we are under as Christians, tho a Covenant of Grace, yet is truly conditional (whatever some murmur to the contrary) to fear the God of Heaven, and to stand in awe of his Majesty. *Behold therefore the Goodness and Severity of God! on them that fell, Severity; but towards thee Goodness, if thou continue in his Goodness: otherwise thou also shall be cut off.* Rom. 11. 22. Heb. 4. 1. But it is furthermore our Duty, for that we are more subject to err than *Adam* was, for all grant he had Free-will, and Sufficiency of Ability to stand had he used it. But tho some of us do hold we have a liberty of Will, yet we must all confess our Power to be very small, without intervening Grace, either to resist Temptations, or to do acts of Righteousness. *Not that we are sufficient to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. 3. 5.

There is a Distinction of Fear towards God much spoken of, to wit, a servile Fear, and a filial Fear. The first they would exclude from a Christian. But if by servile Fear be intended no more than to fear God, as a good Servant is to fear his Master, I can see no reason to exclude it: *If I be a Master, where is my Fear? saith the Lord.* Mal. 1. 16. It seems God's Servants must fear him. But perhaps the meaning of the distinction is this: *By filial Fear is meant an holy Dread, lest we do any thing that is evil, or leave undone the thing that is good; and by servile Fear, is meant a Fear of Punishment only.* If this be it, I shall say little to it, believing, whoever makes this distinction, would have all Men, and specially Christians, to fear God so as to depart from all Evil, and to do

Good

Good, leſt Judgment be the Portion of their Cup from the Lord.

Fear God; that is, ſtand in awe of his Majeſty, worſhip and ſerve him, and him only. 1 *Sam.* 12. 14. *Only fear the Lord, and ſerve him with all your Heart.* Pſal. 45. 11. *He is thy Lord, and worſhip thou him. Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Mat. 4. 10. This is God's Right, we muſt only pay it to him. When *Peter* was put upon this Strait, whether to pleaſe or fear Men, when his Service to God was the matter in queſtion, his Speech was very frank and reſolute, *Acts* 4. 19. *Whether it be right in the ſight of God, to hearken unto Men more than unto God, judg ye.* This then muſt ever become good Chriſtians in matters of Religion, to ſtick cloſe to that which is right in the ſight of God, however it may be countermanded by Man. The Condeſcenſions of holy *Paul* were ſo wiſely attempered, as even then when he was made all things to all Men, and paying his debt of Love to the Wiſe and Unwiſe, ſo as to be without Law to them that were without Law, and under the Law to them that were under the Law; yet *he was not without Law to God, but under the Law to Chriſt*; he would not ſin to pleaſe any, nor *do Evil that Good might come: For the Fear of the Lord is clean, the Beginning of Wiſdom*, and that which muſt keep us company all our days; elſe we lie open to the fiery Darts of Satan, which will both hit and hurt, where the Fear of the Lord is abſent. *Therefore bleſſed is the Man that feareth always.* This is that Grace which held *Joſeph* back from Uncleanneſs, *Nehemiah* from Self-endedneſs in God's Service, when others made it burthenſom: *This did not I*, ſaith he, *becauſe of the Fear of the Lord.*

Work out your own Salvation with Fear and Trembling, ſaith the Apoſtle. *I trembled in my ſelf, that I might reſt in the Day of Trouble*, ſaith the Prophet. *I exceedingly fear and quake*, ſaid *Moſes. I am ſo troubled I cannot ſpeak*, ſaid *David.* And ſhall we not exceedingly fear, and ſtand in awe of that Majeſty, which made theſe Pillars in the Church to tremble? Beware of a ſtupid and careleſs Spirit, for that will ſoon prove a revolting Spirit. *Jer.* 5. 22, 23. *David* makes that awful Fear of God an expreſs Duty to all; *Pſal.* 76. 7. *Thou, even thou art to be feared; and who may ſtand in thy preſence, when once thou art angry?* Without a godly Fear no Service to God is acceptable. *Heb.* 12. And he is therefore *greatly to be feared in the Aſſembly of the Saints.*

Thus

Thus much in general. We shall now endeavour to describe the Man that walks in the Fear of God, in a few Particulars. And,

1. He that truly fears God, worships and serves him, *must be delivered from the Fear of Man.* When *David* is considering how to fear or serve God aright, *Psal.* 119. 45. he tells us, he will *walk at Liberty*; he will have his Heart free from that which hinders due Obedience to God. And as to Matters of Religion, Christians are *Christ's Freemen.* And therefore our Saviour (who was the most faithful to *Cæsar* that ever Man was) in this Case absolutely prohibits the Fear of Man; *Fear not him that can kill the Body.* And it is certain, the *Fear of Man brings a Snare*, as appears in the Case of the Pharisees: They could not confess Christ, tho they believed in him, *for they feared to be put out of their Synagogues*; *they loved the Praise of Men more than the Praise of God.* He that thus fears Man, cannot fear God. Let us hear the Apostle *Paul*, he is plain; *Do I now persuade Men, or God?* (that is, *do I preach the Doctrine of God or Man?*) *if I yet pleased Men, I should not be the Servant of Christ.* We see here the Difference between a faithful Christian and Minister of Christ, and those that serve the Times: The latter always preach something that is of Man, lest they should suffer Persecution for the Cross of Christ; the former fears neither Men nor Angels, so as to give consent to another Gospel, or any thing which perverts the Gospel of Christ. *Gal.* 1. 4 to 11.

2. He that truly fears God, *will give to God the Things which are God's.* This Rule, of all others, should be observed by Christians, because it proceeds from Christ himself, upon such a special occasion, *Mat.* 22. 21. as wherein the Right of Kings, and God's Right over Men are enquired into, and the Case determined by the Lord Christ, to the silencing his captious Adversaries. *Cæsar's* Right must be given, and God's Right must not be with-held. Earthly Things, or our Obedience in Civil Cases, is here stated upon *Cæsar*; there is therefore a necessity, that Obedience in Religious Cases be due to God, or else he has nothing peculiar in or over us. Sith therefore God Almighty has reserved all religious Obedience to himself, and that we must every Man *give an Account of himself unto God*, 2 Cor. 5. Let all that fear God, give to him in religious Performances, the Things which have his Image and Super-

Superſcription upon them, leſt he reject both the Offering, and the Offerer, with, *Who hath required this at your hands?* Did not God provide by his expreſs Law, that his Sacrifices ſhould not be *changed at Man's Will, a good for a bad, nor a bad for a good?* Lev. 27. 10. Does not *Iſaiah* cry out againſt them that preſumed to *change God's Ordinances, as Breakers of the everlaſting Covenant?* Iſa. 24. 5. It fared very ill with *Nadab* and *Abihu*, for offering *that Fire which God commanded not.* Levit. 10. 1, *&c.* The *Corinthians* were ſmote with Sickneſs and Death, for prophaning the *Lord's Table* with their *own Supper*, 1 Cor. 11. 22, 30. *David* himſelf was afraid of God, when he altered the manner of carrying the Ark of God, 1 Chron. 13. And this Inſtance made him afterwards *give to God the Things that were God's*, namely, to ſerve him in due Order, 1 *Chron.* 15. Let the Uſe of all be, to provoke us to ſerve God *with godly Fear*, to ſtand in awe of his Word, to ſerve him with all poſſible exactneſs, according to the very Rules therein contained, that we may have the Commendation of good and faithful Servants, as it was in the Caſe of *Noah*, Gen. 6. 22. *Thus did* Noah, *according to all that God commanded him, ſo did he.*

3. *He that truly fears God, will ever preſerve a good Conſcience towards God.* But this can never be, where the inner Man is not pure, and the Heart delighted with the Service of God. Of ſome we read, that they profeſs high, but *their Minds and Conſciences are defiled*, Tit. 1. 16. Others that ſo walked before the Lord, as to gain this Reputation, that they *did that which was right in the ſight of the Lord, but not with a perfect Heart.* 2 *Chr.* 25. 2. Now God is he that perfectly knows the Heart, and ſearches the Heart, and takes pleaſure in Uprightneſs; and he knows, and will make all Men know, that as the wilful Neglect of Duties, I mean religious Duties, are an Evidence of an evil Conſcience; ſo the keeping back part, or ſerving God deceitfully, or ſerving God under a colour, without Conſcience of the Service, are the ſame, and ſhall, with the Perſons ſo worſhipping him, be rejected, as thoſe that do not fear God. *For it ſhall come to paſs in the Day of the Lord's Sacrifice, that he will puniſh them that ſwear by the Lord, and that ſwear by* Malcham; *and them that are turned back from the Lord, and them that have not ſought the Lord, nor enquired after him.* Zeph. 1. 5, 6.

4. *He that feareth God, will not reſiſt the Power of Princes; yet will he do what God commands, tho all the Princes in the World forbid him;*

him; nor will he do what God forbids, tho all the Princes in the World ſhould command it.

What our Chriſtian Obligations to Princes are, I hope to ſhew, in handling the next Direction in our Text. We are here only to ſhew, that no worldly Power can make void what God commands, nor make that lawful which God's Word forbids. The God of Heaven forbids worſhipping or bowing down to Images or Idols, *Exod.* 20. *Nebuchadnezzar* commands the contrary, *Dan.* 3. 4,5. under pain of ſuffering the fiery Furnace. Now this was a mighty Prince, to whom God had given a Kingdom, and great Glory; yet *Shadrach* and his Companions would not do his Command, but told him plainly, *They would not ſerve his Gods, nor worſhip the Golden Image which he had ſet up. Dan.* 3. 18. It has been the Unhappineſs of Earthly Gods, to countermand the Commands of the God of Heaven, without which there would have been but few Martyrs: But the greatneſs of their Multitude ſhews the certainty of this Truth, That God's Will muſt be obeyed, what Troubles ſoever attend us from the Princes of this World for ſo doing. Indeed I find this Doctrine owned by moſt. For the Papiſts themſelves, upon *Acts* 4. 19. ſay thus: 'If any Magiſtrate command 'againſt God, that is to ſay, forbid Catholick Chriſtian Men to 'preach, or ſerve God, this ſame muſt be their Anſwer, (meaning that Anſwer which *Peter* gave, &c.) tho they be whipped 'or killed for their Labour. And Dr. *Fulk* allows the Note, but yet would not have the Papiſts to have any benefit by it, (ſo partial are Men, when uppermoſt.) We ſee then, by conſent of Chriſtians generally, the Voice of God muſt be obeyed in Things religious, tho the Princes of the Earth ſay Nay. And to this agrees the holy Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.* 119. 23. *Princes ſate and ſpake againſt me*; that is, they ſat on the Throne, and dereed Things againſt him: *But thy Servaut did meditate in thy Statutes.* He would not depart from the Ways of God, tho he was perſecuted. *Pſal.* 119.161. *Princes perſecuted me without a cauſe, but my Heart ſtandeth in awe of thy Word.*

But here it may be fit to obviate an Objection.

It will be ſaid, *Tho it is true, that all that fear God, are bound thus to obey God, and not Man, in Matters of Religion, and to ſuffer patiently, rather than to ſin; yet whether in Things indifferent, which*

are neither commanded nor forbidden; if Princes here make use of their Authority, Christians are not bound to obey actively? As for Example, about the Place of Worship, &c.

To this it may be answered; Seeing God has forbidden no Place, if that were all the Business, he were a mad Man that would not actually obey; and consequently he is bound to obey Authority in every Case that is like it; as thus: It is a Duty for a Nation, in a time of common Calamity, to humble themselves by Fasting and Prayer; and doubtless 'tis best this be done at the same time, and none so fit to order this as the Magistrate: If therefore Authority command the tenth, twentieth, or thirtieth Day of such a Month, for such a Service, I doubt not but he should be guilty of Sin, that should in this refuse such Time, meerly because it is appointed by the Magistrate's Authority. And if there be an hundred Cases of this kind, the same Answer must be given in them all, for ought I see; or else under pretence of fearing God, we shall dishonour the King, which is a Sin of an high Nature.

Tho Christians be Subjects to Princes, yet Princes are Subjects to God, and in the Sphere where God has set them, can do nothing more pleasing to him, than to promote the Interest of Religion, by discountenancing Prophaneness and Irreligion, and by giving Encouragement to the Lovers of it. But then as they are Subjects to Christ, they are Fellow-Servants with their Subjects, (yea, the Angels think not themselves too high to be called so, *Rev.* 19. 10.) and therefore must with their Subjects be obedient to *one Lawgiver*, even Jesus, and not assume Power to make Laws for the Consciences of Men in Religion, nor to force them to go beyond their Knowledg and Faith in Things of that kind, *seeing what is not of Faith is Sin, and we must every one give an Account of himself unto God.*

5. The last Particular I shall insist upon, as necessary to the true Fear of God, is to avoid Covetousness and Worldly-mindedness. Covetousness is said to be Idolatry. And he that is a covetous Person, makes little further use of Religion, than to be a Cloak for his Iniquity; he fears not God, he serves not the Lord Christ, but his own Belly; for this he preaches, for this he prays, and without this he will do neither. These are the Men that make Merchandize of the Word of God, *supposing* (as the Apostle saith) *that Gain is Godliness.* I meet with a notable Passage in our

our Engliſh Chronicles; in the ſixth Century, 'tis ſaid, *The Clergy of* Britain *ſet all their Mind to ſerve God, and not the World, the Heart, and not the Belly; Wherefore then were they had in great Reverence and Honour. But as they encreaſed in earthly Treaſure, ſo they decreaſed in heavenly Treaſure.* Fab. Chron. 5 part. cap. 134. Let all that fear God, beware of this evil Diſeaſe, eſpecially ſuch as are Miniſters of Chriſt. *No Man can ſerve two Maſters; ye cannot ſerve God and Mammon*, ſaith our Saviour, *Mat.* 6. 24.

Thus much of the Fear of God; let us now conſider the Debt which we owe to our King.

Honour the King.

Altho by the Order of our Text, we are to ſpeak of this weighty Subject in the laſt place, yet it is not the leaſt part of our Duty: For as the ancient Chriſtians were wont to ſpeak, ſo it remains an eternal Truth, *That as God is above the Emperor, ſo none other is above the Emperor but God.* And conſequently our Duty, next to Almighty God, is to our Prince; as we ſee here in our Text, the Honour of the King is provided for, next to the Fear of God. We have already ſhewed, in the opening of the Words, that the King here meant, or immediately ſpoken of, was an Heathen King, and a great Idolater in his Religion; and yet the Holy-Ghoſt does here oblige all Chriſtians, even of the higheſt Rank, to honour ſuch Kings, *Peter* himſelf, and conſequently all his Succeſſors not excepted; for indeed he had learned this Obedience of one higher than himſelf, even Jeſus Chriſt, and therefore muſt needs recommend the ſame to all Chriſtians. And hence the Doctrine is,

Doct. IV. *All Chriſtians are bound by Goſpel-Rules to be good Subjects to Princes, to honour their Perſons, and conſciencioufly to obey their Authority.*

1. To evince this great Truth, it may be needful to ſhew, *That Kingly Power or Government is of God.* Not in the Sence (prophanely objected by ſome Writers) wherein Plagues, Diſeaſes, and Puniſhments are of God; for the Apoſtle *Paul* doth expreſly contradict ſuch an ungodly Expoſition, *Rom.* 15. 1, &c. wherein he

avers, even of the ſame Kingly Power ſpoken of by *Peter*, *That it was ordained of God*; that the Magiſtrate was *God's Miniſter* to the Chriſtian Man, (as well as any other) *for Good, to execute Wrath upon him that does Evil.* Which Word, *Miniſter*, refers evidently to him that bears the Sword of Juſtice, and not to the Power only, which yet he affirms to be of God, and confirms it by this Argument, *For there is no Power but of God; the Powers that be, are ordained of God.* And this is the only comfortable Ground of Obedience to the higher Powers, to be well ſatisfied in this, that whether it fall out our Obedience ſhall be active or paſſive, yet therein we conform our ſelves to the Will of God, or to his Ordinance; *And he that ſhall reſiſt the Power, does reſiſt the Ordinance of God.*

2. That Kingly Government is of God as clearly, if not more clearly than any other Form of Government, is very plain from the Text it ſelf, conſidered with the Context, *verſ.* 13, 14. *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governours, as unto them that are ſent by him*, &c. Where Supremacy over all Perſons in Things Civil, is ſo clearly given to the King by God himſelf, even over Governours, as well as the People governed, that it muſt in no wiſe be denied.

3. If it be objected, that tho the Power Magiſtratical be of God, yet the Form or Mode of it is of Man, becauſe (according to the Greek) 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. may be read thus, *Submit your ſelves to every humane Creature.* To this I ſay; The Words, *Humane Creature*, are better underſtood of the Laws made by Humane Authority, than of the Magiſtrates themſelves: For as the moſt high God, and he only, can give Being and Power to a Divine Law, inſomuch that no Power on Earth can create ſuch a Law; ſo Earthly Gods, and none but they, can create and give Power to an humane Law; and Laws thus made, are rightly called *Humane Creatures*, or Ordinances of Men, (as our Engliſh expreſſes it.) And when Laws are thus made, tho they ſhould happen to be ill Laws, (as it ſometimes happens to be ſo) yet they muſt be obeyed, (either actively or paſſively) becauſe the Power Magiſtratical muſt not be reſiſted; only the Error of an ill Law muſt be refuſed by all faithful Men, eſpecially in Matters of Religion, as we have ſhewed before.

4. This

4. This great Power which God hath given to Kings and Rulers of the Earth, to make Laws, is (as I conceive) the chief cauſe why they are called Gods, Pſal. 82. 6. *I have ſaid ye are Gods, and all of you are Children of the moſt High:* That is, becauſe of that reſemblance which they have to God himſelf, being decked with Power and Majeſty, to make and execute Laws (in this lower World) which concern the Children of Men as ſuch.

5. And as to the Form of Kingly Government (for this is all that I can find in my Text): Let us hear what God himſelf ſaith. *By me Kings reign, and Princes decree Juſtice; by me Princes rule, and Nobles, even all the Judges of the Earth.* What can be ſaid more in this caſe? If any ſhall ſay, 'tis not God, but Wiſdom that ſpeaks theſe Words, *Prov.* 8. 15, 16. I anſwer, it is Folly that makes the Objection, for this Wiſdom is the Voice of God, becauſe it is the Wiſdom of God. Kings are called *the Lords Anointed.* And not only the Kings of *Iſrael*, but even Heathen Kings alſo. *Iſa.* 45. 1. *Thus ſaith the Lord to his Anointed, even to Cirus.* Now *Cirus* was King of *Perſia*, *Ezra.* 1. 1.

6. If yet it be ſaid, that Government, but not the Form of Government, is of God, but of human Choice, &c. I anſwer, I ſpeak not of a Government to be formed, and not yet in being; but of one eſtabliſhed: and therefore, I ſay, the diſtinction is dangerous. But how ſhall it be a Power or Government without its Form? Does God make an Ordinance or any thing elſe without Form? If ſo, what can you call it? It is the Form that gives every thing to be, or at leaſt to be called what it is. It's bad venturing to ſay, that God makes an Ordinance, and leaves Man to form it, as to the Eſſentials of it. And ſeeing no Nation can long endure, without Government, nor that Government ſubſiſt without Form. It ſeems neceſſary that both be acknowledged to be of God; and conſequently, where the Form of Government is Regal or Kingly, it is of God, and as ſuch to be had in Honour.

That God does by his Providence order and permit Men to tranſact, order, and ſettle the Mode of Government, in Nations which yet are unſetled in that reſpect, does not prove that the Form or Settlement when made is not of God, or not to be eſteemed ſo; becauſe in ſuch an emergency, the Voice of the People, together with God's Providence, muſt therein be acknowledged the Voice of God. For thus in an ordinary way is that Saying true,

By

By me Kings reign, and Princes decree Justice. By me Princes rule, and Nobles, even all the Judges of the Earth. It was the most high God which gave *Nebuchadnezzar* a Kingdom, Majesty, Glory and Honour, *Dan.* 5. 18. who then may question his Regal Power to be of God? It's ill murmuring, worse disputing, worst of all to fight against God. Surely, if *Nebuchadnezzar* must have this Honour given to him as King, even by *Daniel* that Servant of God, because by the Almighty he was thus exalted, altho otherwise he was a sinful Man, a great Idolater; it must needs resolve all doubts that may arise, about the warrantableness of Kingly Government, and all Christians Obedience to it, with respect to all Kings under whom they live, whatsoever.

If it be objected, that some may usurp Kingly Government, and some that have it may abuse it.

I answer; Tho this be true, yet it is nothing to the purpose; for this is incident to all other Forms of Government. And when God permits such things, it's usually for the Sins of the People, as it is written, *For the Transgressions of a Land, many are the Princes thereof*, Prov. 28. 2. *He gave them a King in his Wrath:* But this was because *Israel* had rejected God, and his Prophet *Samuel*. Otherwise God had promised to give his People a King, *Numb.* 23. 21. Yea, the Government of *Moses* himself was after a sort a Regal or Kingly Government, *Deut.* 33. 4, 5. If then it so fall out, that Kings or other Rulers do oppress their Subjects, I know no remedy for the Subject but Prayers and Tears, that God would turn their own Hearts more to his Fear, and the Heart of their Prince towards them; (*For the Hearts of Kings are in his Hands:*) And with patient Suffering, and humble Supplication, to seek for Favour. For Rebellion must by no means be admitted, *For it is as the Sin of Witchcraft*; being against God, as well as against the King, because it is against the Ordinance of God. And hence *Tertullian* well said, *The Christian knows that the Emperor is constituted of God.* And saith the Prophet, *I have delivered all these Countries into the Hands of Nebuchadnezzar:* Who then may take them out of his Hand? Sure none but God, who sets up one, and puts down another, as pleases him. For he that gives can only rightfully take away, and he doth so when Men abuse what he gives. *Mene, Mene, Tekel Upharsin, God hath numbred thy Kingdom, and finished it, —— and given it to the Medes and Persians*, Dan. 5. 25, 26.

If

If it be objected from that Paſſage, *They have ſet up Kings, and not by me*; that Kingly Government is of Man, not of God.

I anſwer; This rather proves the contrary, for here a diſorder only is reproved in the way of doing that, which they could not do rightly but by him, that is, God. They ſo ſet up a King, as *they rejected God, that he ſhould not reign over them*, 1 Sam. 8.7. Hence it was that *Samuel* gave them that Reproof and Exhortation, 1 Sam. 12.20. *Ye have done all this Wickedneſs, yet turn not aſide from following the Lord, but ſerve the Lord with all your Heart.* But God did not deny them a King: No, but he had given them direction how to chuſe them a King, *Deut.* 17.14, 15, 16. And moſt certain it is, that of all Civil Governments which God hath ſet up in the World, Kingly Government is the moſt frequent, and permanent, ſo far as the Scripture gives any account of this Matter: And indeed it holds the neareſt reſemblance to that Government which God himſelf exerciſes over the World in general; For he is King of Kings, and his Kingdom ruleth over all.

Let us then come more directly to the Text, *Honour the King.* And,

1. Of the Honour which we owe to his Royal Perſon. *We muſt eſteem it very highly*, and behave our ſelves towards him with that Fear and Reverence which belongs to him, as placed next unto God. *My Son, fear thou the Lord and the King*, Prov. 24.21. *Give unto Cæſar the things which are Cæſar's, and to God the things which are God's.* So the Text, *Fear God, Honour the King.* We ſee the King holdeth the next place of Honour unto God. Hence *Tertullian*, perſonating the Chriſtians of his time, ſays, *We honour the Emperour as a Man next unto God.* And ſaith *Optatus*, *Above the Emperour there is none but God, who made the Emperour.* If we will honour the King's Perſon, or eſteem him highly, we muſt not only upon all fit occaſions, give him (with Reverence) his Place and Titles of Honour; but alſo defend his Perſon with the hazard of our own, as thoſe did who would not ſuffer King *David* to hazard himſelf, ſaying, *Thou art worth ten thouſand of us.* Let us hate to think or ſpeak evil or contemptuouſly of him whom God hath exalted, and ſet over us.

We

We find a remarkable Inſtance of true Love and Loyalty to a Prince, 2 *Sam.* 15. 19, 20, 21. Here tho *Ittai* was willed by the King, not to put himſelf in danger for him, yet he anſwers thus, *As the Lord liveth, and as my Lord the King liveth, ſurely in what place my Lord the King ſhall be, whether in Death, or in Life, even there alſo will thy Servant be.* This poor exiled Stranger (for ſuch he was) ſhall riſe up in Judgment againſt many native Subjects, who have done quite contrary hereunto even in our days.

2. *We muſt Honour him in Love.* Sincere Love, and Loyal Affection, as he is King, can in no wiſe be wanting in a good Subject: Nor can we honour the King heartily, if we do not love him entirely. Now he that truly loves his Prince, has him much in his ſerious Thoughts, eſpecially when he prays to the God of Heaven: He will not then forget him whom he truly Loves, whom he honours in Love. If he love him, he will pray for him; perhaps that is all the good he can do his Prince; and in this a mean Subject may ſerve his King, as much as any, ſo that his Prayer be Serious and Godly. It is highly obſervable, how the duty of making Prayer for all Men, and particularly for Kings and Rulers, with Supplication, Interceſſion, and giving of Thanks, is required of Chriſtians; eſpecially of thoſe in the Miniſtry: That by the Miniſters conſtant and devout performance of this Duty in behalf of all that are in Authority, the Hearts of the People may be more endeared towards their Prince, and themſelves hereby inſtructed to perform their Duty, and manifeſt their Love to their Governours in like manner, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. And to enforce the Exhortation to this Duty, the Apoſtle tells us, that it is good and acceptable in the ſight of God our Saviour, *verſ.* 3.

3. The next Demonſtration of honouring the King, ſhall be taken from the manner of our Language, and the matter of our Diſcourſe when concerned to ſpeak of him, or of his Doings. In theſe we muſt hate the thoughts of Scurrility, or reflecting Expreſſions; for the Tongue is the Index of the Mind, and we are expreſly forbidden to curſe or ſpeak evil of the King, even in our Bed-Chamber; for theſe things are ſo odious, that Providence will fight againſt ſuch as do ſo, and the Iniquity of ſuch doings will return upon the Offenders: *For a Bird in the Air ſhall carry the News, and that which hath Wings ſhall tell the Tidings*, Eccleſ. 10. 20. Are they not marked out in Scripture for the worſt ſort of Men, that *are not afraid to ſpeak evil of Dignities?* More daring and

and presumptuous than Angels, who are great in Authority, and may lawfully do more than Men, yet they dare not bring a railing Accusation against the Devil, who is the Prince of Darkness; but they refer the wrong done to them unto God, who both can and will rebuke him. But why may not the good Angels rebuke Satan? Why they know (as wicked as he is) he could do nothing about the Body of *Moses*, nor any thing else, without License from the Almighty: He must indeed be withstood in his Temptations, but he must not be rail'd on it seems. And then what manner of Men are they that will take Liberty to rail on their Princes, if they do not what they would have them? Nay, tho they should do Evil, yet must they in no wise be evil spoken of. *Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor speak evil of the Ruler of my People*, Exod. 22. 28. Acts 23. 5.

Object. *But have not the Prophets reproved Kings when they did Evil?*

I answer, Yea; God reproved them by his Prophets frequently. And no doubt that Men of God, such as have Commission from him, may and ought to deal faithfully with Kings and Rulers, when they do that which is Evil in the sight of the Lord. But this is that which is intolerable, that the Errors or Infirmities of Princes should be made the Subject of Mens Discourse: Surely they are rather to be lamented before the Lord in secret. *Is it meet to say to a King, Thou art wicked? and to Princes, Ye are ungodly?* Job 34. 18. The true Sence of these Interrogatives is, No. It is by no means thus to reflect upon a King. St. *Paul* having spoken rashly, *Acts* 23. 5. corrects and excuses himself, by saying, *I wist not, Brethren, that he was God's High Priest: For it is written, Thou shalt not speak Evil of the Ruler of my People.* Let Christians beware of this evil Disease which reigns in these days. Let them remember, *They are bound by Gospel-Rules to Honour the King*, next to God himself.

Thus much of the Honour which we owe to the King's Person.

Let us now consider, how we are obliged by Gospel-Rules to obey his Authority. And here,

1. Let the Subject consider how much God has set him below his Prince, for Obedience seldom issues from a lofty Mind. It's not impossible for a Subject, in conceit, to be a Prince's Mate, and

then Subjection is Death to him. That Paſſage concerning *Mephiboſheth*, the Son of *Jonathan*, 2 *Sam.* 9. 8. was written for our Learning. When he conſidered the Majeſty of King *David*, and his own Condition as a Subject; *What is thy Servant* (ſaith he) *that thou ſhouldſt look upon ſuch a dead Dog as I am?* Such ſelf-abaſing Thoughts in a Subject (eſpecially thoſe of low degree) does argue an Heart full of deſires to honour him whom God has exalted as his King, and a Mind willing to obey him. Let Chriſtians learn by this Example.

2. Our Saviour hath led us the right way: *Give unto Cæſar the things which are Cæſar's.* But what things are they? Why the Things which bear his *Image* and *Superſcription*. *Whoſe Image and Superſcription is this*, ſays Chriſt? They ſay, *Cæſar's*. *Therefore*, ſaith Chriſt, *Give unto Cæſar*, &c. We may hence fairly infer, that whatſoever bears the King's Authority, or is required in his name, muſt be obeyed. *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King as Supream, or unto Governours, as unto thoſe that are ſent by him.* Mark, if they be ſent by him, they bear his Image, or Superſcription, they repreſent the King; ſubmit, ſubmit, either Actively or Paſſively, here's no reſiſting, for here comes *Cæſar*. Only here it muſt be minded, *Cæſar's* Superſcription is only to be put to the Ordinances of Man. None can put a Divine Character upon a Law but God; and we muſt give to God the things which are God's, Divine Obedience, or Obedience in all divine things, to God; Civil Obedience, or Obedience in all civil things, to *Cæſar*. Thus has our Saviour divided the matter of Chriſtians (and all Mens) Obedience to God, and to *Cæſar*. Let us hold to this moſt juſt Settlement, a better cannot poſſibly be given.

3. St. *Paul* will have Chriſtians Subjection to *Cæſar*, to proceed from them of pure Conſcience, or for *Conſcience ſake*, Rom. 13. *not only Wrath*. And of this Reaſon wills that we give all the Aſſurance that we can to Princes, that we are heartily their Subjects; And willingly obedient in all things which concerns their Government over us. This Principle of Obedience in the Heart, will make our Obedience to Princes delightful and durable; they that have this good Principle in them, will never be weary of any reaſonable Labour, Service, or Hazard for their King: where it is wanting, the King can put no confidence in them. This is ſo reaſonable, ſo neceſſary, that he that hath not ſuch an Heart for his Sove-

Sovereign, is unworthy the name of a Subject: He is no Subject. From this Principle, we are to pay tribute also, *Rom.* 13. 6, 7. and not grudgingly. And when Princes see Men ready, in conscience of their Duty, to serve them as God's Vicegerents; how naturally will this draw back again the influence of all Princely Favours? That Prince who is thus happy in the Obedience of his Subjects, will doubtless, as a Loving Father, contrive the best to make his Subjects happy under his Government.

4. How clearly is our Duty to our Superiors delivered by St. *Paul*, Tit. 3. 1, *&c. Put them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates, to be ready to every good work.* Let the Power be in this or the other Form (for all Nations have not the same Form of Government) you must not dispute that, you must chearfully obey, as becomes Men of a ready Mind, to do the good commanded by Magistrates; you must not ask whether they be Heathen Kings, or Christian Kings: You must obey all Kings or Magistrates, *For they are God's Ministers, attending on this very thing*; i. e. the Government of the World: a very necessary thing, without which human Society cannot subsist. Here is no Limitation of time for your Subjection to Princes, Powers, and Magistrates; you are under this Obligation so long as St. *Paul*'s Epistle to *Titus* is Canonical. Let not then any idle Dream of the change of Dispensations subvert you from the simplicity of the Gospel-Rules delivered in this great Case, in which the Happiness of Christian Men, as such, is much concerned: *For, who shall harm them if they be careful Followers of that which is good?* 1 Pet. 3. 13. But if it so fall out, that notwithstanding your care in this matter, ye *must suffer for righteousness sake, then happy are ye*, &c. for still religious Obedience is due to God, and must be paid to him.

5. This place, *Tit.* 3. 1. commands Christians *to be ready to every good work*. *Obj.* What if the Powers *command otherwise? what then?* For answer to this, we know we have an Obligation to obey God antecedent to that of our Obedience to Kings (as has been shewed.) He commands us to abstain from every appearance of Evil, 1 *Thess.* 5. 22. Wherefore if the Power shall be so unhappy to command otherwise, as it fell out in the case of *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan.* 5. there the Penalty must be patiently endured. And then the Powers are still obeyed. And tho some vainly upbraid us, that there either is no such thing as Passive Obedience; or that our Obedience in this is like the Obedience of a Felon, when he goes to

the Gallows, *&c.* Such blind *Byards* may be pleaſed to know, the Felon hath ordinarily nothing to chuſe, but muſt neceſſarily dye: whereas the ſuffering Chriſtian has Life and Liberty offered if he will but worſhip ſo, or ſo. Now here he chuſes rather to ſuffer, than to do that which he conceives (at leaſt) to be ſin in the ſight of God, that ſo he may be a faithful Witneſs for God; and therein a Bleſſing to his Prince and to his Nation, which is his only way to ſilence the Ignorance of fooliſh Men; whoſe unwary Objections reflect not only upon all true Martyrs ſince the World began, but upon Chriſt himſelf, who for this cauſe was hated and perſecuted, becauſe *He bore witneſs to the Truth*, Joh. 18. 37. and that the *Works of the World were Evil*, John 7. 7.

6. *But if it ſhould happen that Princes ſhould ſome way intrench upon the Civil Rights of their Subjects? What then muſt we do?* What then? Why it is dangerous to contend with them in ſuch caſes; we are taught otherwiſe by the Example of our Saviour, in his direction to St. *Peter*, in the caſe of paying Tribute to the Roman Magiſtrates, *Mat.* 17. 25, 26, 27. For it is evident from this place, that our Saviour was not obliged by Law to pay Cuſtom or Tribute, but was free in that caſe; yet it being demanded, he adviſes *Peter* to pay it, both for himſelf, and his Maſter: So careful was he to avoid Offences, that he will pay Tribute, and adviſes his Followers to do it too, tho it be in their own wrong. A good precedent to all Chriſtians to be humble, and not to contend with Authority in or about indifferent things: Would God they would conſider it.

7. But it may here be demanded, Whether Princes may not warrantably puniſh ſuch as ſubmit not to the Religion by them eſtabliſhed, from the Example of King *Artaxerxes*, Ezra. 7. 26. *Whoſoever will not do the Law of thy God, and the Law of the King, let Judgment be executed ſpeedily upon him, whether it be unto Death, or to Baniſhment, or to Confiſcation of Goods, or to Impriſonment?*

I confeſs, this Objection requires a ſerious Anſwer. And with ſubmiſſion to better Judgments, I ſhall ſay a few Things in Anſwer to it. And it ſeems by the Scope and Contexture of the Commiſſion given to *Ezra* by *Artaxerxes*, that theſe Things are evident:

1. That the King did not himſelf embrace the Religion of the Jewiſh Nation, but retained ſtill his former Religion; for tho he did fear the God of *Iſrael*, yet he never calls him his God, but the

the God of Heaven, and the God of *Ezra*, &c.

2. That God had by a ſpecial Providence, and Motion from himſelf, diſpoſed the Heart of the King of *Perſia*, to give free Liberty to the Jews, which were Captives in his Dominions, to go forth to ſerve their God; verſ. 13. *I make a Decree, that all they of the People of* Iſrael, *and of his Prieſts and Levites in my Realm, which are minded of their own free Will to go up to Jeruſalem, to go with thee, —— to do whatſoever ſhall ſeem good to them, after the Will of your God.*

3. The King does not only give a preſent Supply to *Ezra*, as a *Free-Will-Offering* to the God of *Iſrael*, verſ. 15. but alſo provides for his neceſſary Supply for the future, *out of the King's Treaſury*, verſ. 20.

4. The King fearing the Diſpleaſure of the God of *Iſrael* againſt himſelf and his Sons, does require *Ezra*, that *whatſoever was required by the God of Heaven ſhould be diligently done.*

5. The King alſo empowers *Ezra* to ſet Magiſtrates and Judges over the People, and in ſo doing, gave *Ezra* a Magiſtratical Power, or made him a Magiſtrate; and ſo gives Order, that whoſoever would not be obedient to him ſhould be puniſhed, *verſ.* 25, 26. This is the Sum of the Commiſſion given to *Ezra* by the King of *Perſia.*

In all which, nothing appears, that any of his Subjects ſhould be compelled to alter their Religion, nor be forced to be all of one Religion: But a free Liberty is given to the Jews, (as well as to others) to ſerve their God according to his Law, and a Reſtraint laid upon them that would hinder them. And *Ezra* is empowered (indeed) to puniſh thoſe that were under the Law of *Moſes*, according to that Law, if they would not do it; and ſuch as withſtood his Authority, as a Magiſtrate, which he received from the King, were to be puniſhed by the Law of the King of *Perſia*, who had the Power of Life and Death in his hand, which the Jewiſh Nation had not at this time.

6. We may learn hence, that it is indeed a bleſſed Thing for all Kings to fear the God of Heaven, and to advance the Intereſt of Religion in their Dominions; and it is as evident, that Religion muſt always be ſetled according to the Law of God, with the greateſt Care that may be, and none puniſhed for keeping the Law of God; but for breaking the Law of God, and the Law of the King, which did concur with the Law of God. Here were great

Pu-

Puniſhments aſſigned; and yet not to be inſiſted on too raſhly, in the Times of the Goſpel, nor in Caſes purely Evangelical, or of the Chriſtian Religion, as it is digniſied above the Principles of common Reaſon and Morality: In theſe Caſes I cannot ſee how it ſhould be in the power of Magiſtrates to compell any againſt their Will, ſeeing it's God, not Man, that makes Chriſtians. *Epheſ.* 2. 10. *We are his Workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works, which God hath before ordained, that we ſhould walk in them.* And God gives none the Privileges of his Children, until they be his Children; nor are they his Children, till they be *born, not of Blood, nor of Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.* John 1. 12, 13.

7. Nor muſt we deny, but acknowledg, that God's Vicegerents are authorized by the Almighty to be Keepers of both Tables, ſo as to defend his Sovereignty, and to encourage true Religion, againſt Atheiſts and Idolaters, that worſhip a Creature inſtead of the Creator; for ſo it is written, *Job* 31. 26, 27, 28. *If I beheld the Sun when it ſhined, or the Moon walking in Brightneſs, and my Heart hath been ſecretly enticed, or my Mouth hath kiſſed my Hand; this alſo were an Iniquity to be puniſhed by the Judge, for I ſhould have denied God that is above.*

Now let us write (or deſire the Lord to write) the Words of our Text in our Hearts; *Honour all Men*; *Love the Brotherhood*; *Fear God*; *Honour the King*. Surely that Chriſtian, that ſhall make it his Buſineſs to do theſe things heartily, *ſhall be acceptable to God, and approved of Men*; there ſhall be *no occaſion of ſtumbling in him.* But if Chriſtians be too buſy to inſpect Matters of State, or to meddle with thoſe that contrive or project any thing to the diſturbance and ſubverſion of the Government in the Kingdoms where they live, they ſhall never be able to recommend their Religion (be it never ſo good in it ſelf) to the acceptance of their Governors, nor to obtain from them to be *Nurſing-Fathers* to it; but ſhall certainly expoſe themſelves to the Diſpleaſure of God, as well as to the Wrath of Princes. And God himſelf will vindicate the Honour of his Ordinance of Worldly Government, againſt all that deſpiſe it, as well as againſt all that abuſe their Power in it; *for there is no Reſpect of Perſons with God.* Rom. 2. 11.

Let

Let me therefore exhort you, my Brethren, (as you know it has been my manner these thirty Years) *to follow Peace with all Men, and Holiness*; to study to be quiet, and especially in troublesom Times; *to fear the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change*, Prov. 24. 21. Many have undone themselves by itching after Changes in Worldly Government. God only knows what is best for you, and for the Nation. They that are weary of this, are soon weary of that; few know what they would have; and who is able to devise any thing that will please all Humors, and suit all Interests? Bless God for your Prince, and for the Peace you have enjoyed under him, and pray for him, and for all that are in Authority, that under them (if the Will of God be so) you may lead quiet and peaceable Lives in all Godliness and Honesty. They that will not pray for all that are in Authority, do not fear God, for they contemn his Word, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. They do not love, and so they cannot honour the King.

You are at present under Sufferings, for the conscientious performance of what you believe to be your Duty towards God in Matters of Religion; humble your selves under the mighty Hand of God, and suffer patiently what Trials it shall please God to exercise you under, that (as our Apostle hath it, 1 *Pet.* 1. 7.) *the Trial of your Faith being much more precious than that of Gold that perisheth, tho it be tried with Fire, might be found unto Praise, and Honour, and Glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.* I say no more; the Lord direct you. *AMEN.*

NOW if it shall please God, to bring this faithful (tho unpolished) Discourse to his Majesties Royal Hand, I do hereby in all Humility prostrate my self at his Royal Feet, with this humble Supplication.

That it would graciously please his Majesty, according to his wonted Goodness, and Princely Clemency, to consider and pity the distressed condition of many of his faithful Subjects,

jects, who dissent from the Church of England *in the case of Infant-Baptism, and some other Ceremonies, and cannot in Conscience to God conform to them; nor deny the exercise of their Religion, of which they are convinced, and persuaded to be according to the Will of God.*

O let our Lord the King consider, that this is the greatest strait that any honest Christian can be put upon, either to deny what he believes to be true, or profess that to be true, which he believes to be otherwise.

O let the God of Heaven be always his Majesties Chief Counsellour; That by his direction he may rightly distinguish between those that are harmless in his Realm, and such as have abused his Kindnesses (which have been very great, and thankfully to be remembred) and that the present Severities against the Innocent may be abated and removed, lest they be made miserable in their Native Countrey.

God Almighty bless the King, &c.

FINIS.

The SECOND PART of the

APOLOGY

FOR THE

Baptized Believers.

Wherein the GROUNDS of

INFANT-BAPTISM

Are REVIEWED:

In ANSWER to Fourteen ARGUMENTS, delivered by Mr. *Nathaniel Taylor*, M. A. in a SERMON on *Matth.* 28. 19. entituled, ΠΑΙΔΟΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ ΟΡΘΟΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ.

And therewithal,

The Reasons of the Separation of the Baptized Believers, from the Pedobaptists, modestly propounded.

Upon the occasion of their great and long-continued Sufferings.

By *T. Grantham*, a Servant of Christ.

LONDON;
Printed for the Author. 1684.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE Baptized Believers, &c.

PRESENTED

To all Pious and Well-diſpoſed Chriſtians in the Church of *ENGLAND*.

SECT. I.

Honoured and Beloved Brethren,

TO prevent a Miſtake, and to remove an Aſperſion too frequently caſt upon us, be pleaſed to know, that tho we differ from you and others, in ſome things relating to the Conſtitution and Government of a true Church, yet we do not therefore arrogate to our ſelves alone the Chriſtian Name, nor exalt our ſelves in our Imaginations above others; but do believe and hope, that the Number of the ſaved Ones will be gathered out of all ſorts of Chriſtians, who heartily love God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and live holily and charitably among Men, tho they be diverſified in reſpect of Ceremonies, by reaſon of the Place and Government where they live:

Yea, we have Charity for all Men, who are faithful to the Means of Grace afforded them, how ſmall ſoever, knowing that our God delights in Mercy, and does not exact the utmoſt Farthing of any Man.

But for all this, as it is certain there hath been abundance of Errors introduced among Chriſtians, ſo it has pleaſed God to raiſe up a People ſtill to teſtify againſt them, (*the Memories of whom are bleſſed, tho they were frequently perſecuted.*) So we believe it a Duty incumbent upon us, to bear our Teſtimony to what Truth we know, and not to partake with any in their By-Paths in Life or Religion, and yet endeavour as much as in us lieth, after Unity and Concord with all that fear God, and own the Chriſtian Profeſſion.

To which purpoſe we have humbly propoſed what we thought concern'd us, in order to a better Underſtanding and Compliance, in our *Friendly Epiſtle to the Biſhops and Miniſters of the Church of England*, publiſhed ſome Years ago, but has not been publickly taken notice of, till lately one Mr. *Taylor*, a Perſon of Worth for his Integrity, and Zeal for the Proteſtant Intereſt, and for his gentle Diſpoſition towards ſuch as fear God, tho differing from him in the Caſe of Ceremonies.

It hath pleaſed him (I ſay) to take notice of our ſaid Epiſtle, and to *offer ſomething in order to a Compoſure of Differences*, which I confeſs, with him, to be a thing greatly to be deſired. But then he is pleaſed to ſhew us nothing of Mitigation, or Hopes of the removal of the Things which hath occaſioned our Diſunion, but does rather wholly charge the Cauſe of Diviſion upon us, and ſuppoſes our *Difference about Baptiſm, to be the chief Cauſe of our diſſenting from the Church of* England.

But tho this is indeed a matter of great Importance, becauſe true Baptiſm is antecedent to Church-Communion; yet that which is greater in our Judgment, is that open Prophaneneſs, which, God knows, reigns and rages in the Church of *England*, and therewithal, the utter Neglect of Diſcipline to reform thoſe Iniquities; and alſo that perſecuting Spirit, which appears even in too many of the Guides of the Church, by whoſe Cruelty our Sufferings have been much augmented.

For theſe Cauſes we have thought our ſelves concerned to make this our Chriſtian Apology, in which we crave leave to uſe that Freedom of Speech which the Matters depending do require. And yet,

yet, ſeeing we muſt acknowledg that we are not infallible, (as neither does the Church of *England* pretend ſo to be) we ſhall ſpeak under Correction, and by the help of God, with reſolution to ſubmit to a clear Conviction, if indeed it ſhall appear, that the Things wherein we diſſent are juſtifiable on the part of the Church of *England*; but till this be done, it would be Hypocriſy and Baſeneſs in us, to violate our Conſciences in Things pertaining to Religion, to obtain Favour from Men; *for if we ſhould ſo pleaſe Men, we ſhould not be the Servants of Chriſt.* Gal. 1. 10.

And we do the rather deſire to be heard at this time; partly, for that Mr. *Taylor* is pleaſed to impute Folly to us, in ſeparating from the Church of *England*, becauſe we allow of the moſt of the Thirty Nine Articles; but eſpecially being thereunto required by ſome of Eminency and great Authority in the Church of *England*, who alſo told us, That unleſs we could ſhew, *that the Church of* England *does hold ſome Error in point of Faith, or that ſhe does practiſe ſomething in her Religion which is ſinful, we cannot juſtify our Separation from her.* And whether we be able on this wiſe to vindicate our preſent Separation, is the Buſineſs which we pray may be ſeriouſly conſidered.

SECT. II.

A brief Account of the Reaſons why the Baptized Believers cannot conform to the Ceremonies of the Church of England.

REſerving all due Honour to the Church of *England*, ſo far as ſhe holds the Truth in the Thirty Nine Articles, and as ſhe is a good Fortreſs againſt much Popiſh Superſtition and Idolatry; we ſhall humbly make our Objections in three Particulars,

1. Concerning *Infant-Baptiſm.*
2. Concerning her *Diſcipline.*
3. Concerning her *Impoſing of Ceremonies.*

From

From all which we think we may ſafely argue thus :

It is lawful, juſt, and needful, to maintain a prudent and friendly Separation from ſuch a Church, as does believe, hold, and maintain ſuch Things, as are evidently and actually deſtructive of that Chriſtian Liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made his Churches free ; and of that ſacred Baptiſm, and holy Diſcipline, which Chriſt ordained to continue in all Churches to the end of the World.

But the Church of *England* does believe, hold, and maintain ſuch Things, as are evidently and actually deſtructive of that Chriſtian Liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made his Churches free, and of that ſacred Baptiſm, and holy Diſcipline, which Chriſt ordained to continue in all Churches, to the end of the World.

Ergo, It is lawful, juſt, and needful to maintain a prudent and friendly Separation from the Church of *England* in her preſent Parochial Conſtitution.

Supposing the *Major* is not to be denied by any Chriſtian, we ſhall endeavour to make good the *Minor*.

To begin with Sacred Baptiſm. It is evident from the Scripture, and partly from the Confeſſion of the Church of *England*, that the Things prerequiſite to Baptiſm, on the part of every one who is to be joined with the Church Militant, or to be baptized, are theſe : 1. They ought to have the Goſpel preached, or ſome way made known to them. 2. To believe the Goſpel. 3. To repent of Sin. And, 4. Willingly to put on Chriſt in Baptiſm. Or to expreſs it in ſhort : They are, firſt, to be dead with Chriſt ; and then, ſecondly, to be buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm.

Now that the Church of *England* does hold ſuch Things as are evidently and actually deſtructive of this Baptiſm, may in our Judgment be thus proved :

1. She believes, holds, and does teach others to hold, That all, or the very moſt of her Church-Members are regenerate, without hearing the Word of God, without Faith, without Repentance, or any Knowledg of God ; and ſo believes what neither we,

we, nor any Body elſe can underſtand to be true, and errs in Faith.

2. Yet ſhe does not believe that her Members are regenerate at all, till ſhe croſs or ſprinkle them with Water; neither does ſhe know (becauſe ſhe has no ground to believe) that Infants are thereby made anew, ſo as to become the Children of God, and Heirs of Heaven; and believing this without poſſibility (ordinarily) to know it to be true, ſhe errs in Faith.

3. She believes, and maintains, that thoſe ought to be baptized, whom ſhe knows do not, cannot believe, nor repent, nor in any meaſure know God, nor any Duty of Religion; and herein ſhe errs (as we conceive) concerning the Faith.

4. She believes and maintains, that Sponſors do believe and repent for Infants, or that Infants do perform Faith and Repentance by their Sponſors; and believing theſe things, and teaching her Youth to believe them, without any ground from the Word of God, ſhe believes amiſs, or errs in Faith.

5. She holds, that Perſons may lawfully be baptized when they are aſleep, and does actually pretend to baptize Infants when they are aſleep, which we think verily muſt needs be a very great Error both in Faith and Practice.

6. She believes, holds, and maintains, that Croſſing or Sprinkling is a lawful way of Baptizing, when indeed it is no Baptizing at all. Inſomuch as thoſe that uſe that Mode, dare not ſpeak as they act, ſaying, *I ſprinkle thee in the Name*, &c. their Conſcience bearing them witneſs, that the ſacred Act of baptizing in the Name, *&c.* cannot be expreſſed by the word, *Sprinkling*: They therefore believing what they know is not true in this matter, muſt needs err in Faith, as well as in their Practice. And this Error has in a manner deſtroyed the way of Baptizing uſed by *John Baptiſt*, Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

7. Thus tho we grant, that the Church of *England* is no leſs zealous for the Doctrine of Baptiſm than our ſelves, yet it is apparent to us, that ſhe hath accidentally loſt this holy Ordinance, both in reſpect of the Subject and Manner of it, and in the due Uſe and End of it, which was not appointed (nor fitted) to receive new-born Infants into the Church Militant. And by this unwarrantable Change ſhe has defaced the State, and loſt the Praiſe of a true Church, 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. becauſe ſhe has not kept this Ordinance, as it was delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; but hath

rather

rather ſuppreſſed it, and much oppreſſed thoſe that labour to reſtore it to its due Uſe and Practice in all Churches, which is a great Aggravation of all theſe her Errors in Faith and Practice, concerning Sacred Baptiſm.

Sect. III.

Concerning Diſcipline.

WHat manner of Diſcipline the Church of Chriſt ought to obſerve, is ſufficiently declared, *Matth.* 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. *Tit.* 3. and other places. And it is very well expreſſed by a Miniſter of the Church of *England*, in his *Defence of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England*, in theſe Words: *The manner of proceeding in Excommunication is, firſt by gentle Admonition, and that once or twice, given with the Spirit of Meekneſs, even as a Brother, if the Fault be not notoriouſly known, and next, by open Reprehenſion; afterward by publick Sentence of the Church, to put him from the Company of the Faithful, to deliver him to Satan, to denounce him an Heathen, and a Publican, if no Admonition will ſerve, and the Crimes and Perſons be very offenſive.* Thus he.

And to this *Diſcipline* we can heartily ſubſcribe, it being indeed the very ſame which is religiouſly obſerved by the Baptized Believers in this Age and Nation.

But where now ſhall this *Diſcipline* be found in the Church of *England?* Does any one Aſſembly, or Court, of the Church of *England* obſerve it? Or does ſhe not practiſe that in her Courts, which is too evidently deſtructive of it? For ſo far as we can underſtand, inſtead of this brotherly Admonition, Men are clandeſtinely preſented and accuſed, and often excommunicated for they know not what. What Man is now taught or bound by any Order of the Church of *England*, that in caſe his Brother treſpaſs againſt him, by defaming his Reputation, offering Injury to his Perſon, or by wronging him in his Subſtance, to take that brotherly Courſe preſcribed to all Chriſtians, *Mat.* 18.? Or if he would take this Courſe, what Congregation is empowred or allowed to hear or determine the Strife, as Sin is in ſuch caſes committed againſt God?

We

We ſee not how it is poſſible for the Offended, to do his Duty in an orderly way to the Offender; if he go about it, he ſhall probably be derided both by Teacher and People: So far is he from obtaining Juſtice againſt the Offender, in any Congregation of the Church of *England*, becauſe the ancient Diſcipline is an unknown thing to the People generally. And for want of this Chriſtian Government, are Men continually expoſed to Suits and Troubles in Courts of Law, wherein the Poor can have ſmall Help; as it is written, *Eccleſ.* 5. 8. (old Tranſlation) *If thou ſeeſt the Poor to be oppreſſed,* —— *marvel not,* —— *for one great Man keepeth touch with another, and the mighty Men are in Authority over the Poor.*

3. But that which is more grievous: We do not ſee that open Prophaneneſs can be met with, or ſuppreſſed by your Diſcipline: For ſuppoſe a Man be given to Swearing, Lying, Drunkenneſs, and laſcivious Talking, (as God knows, a great Number of the Members of the Church of *England* are known to be ſuch) your Diſcipline ſeems to have no power in ſuch Caſes: for thus ſaith one of your own Miniſters:

Who minds Canon 109, *that prohibits common Swearers, common Drunkards, notorious Whoremaſters, and Whores,* &c. *from the bleſſed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Do not even Biſhops hear Men ſwear a thouſand Oaths, and either do not, or dare not uſe any Diſcipline againſt them?*

But now if a good Man do not ſtand up, and bow to the Altar at the Name of Jeſus, when the Creed is read, becauſe he dares not pay greater Reverence (in a religious way) to any Writing, than he pays to the holy Scriptures; If he dares not uſe the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm, nor ſprinkle his Child, *&c.* then ſhall he be proſecuted as a great Sinner, caſt to the Devil, and laid in Priſon; yea, he is ſentenced already: For in *Canon* 6. thus we read: *Whoſoever ſhall affirm, that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England *are-- ſuperſtitious, or ſuch -- as Men who are zealouſly and godlily affected, may not with any good Conſcience approve them, uſe them, or as Occaſion requireth, ſubſcribe unto them; let him be excommunicated* ipſo facto, *and not reſtored, until he repent, and publickly revoke ſuch his wicked Errors.*

4. Thus (as we conceive) the *Diſcipline* of Righteouſneſs, Mercy, and Charity, eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, is laid aſide; and a Mercenary Court ſet up, holding the Traditions of Men, inſtead

of Christ's Institutions, in Ecclesiastical Government, who also live voluptuously upon the Sins of the People. But as for the Reformation of evil Manners, or the making Peace and Concord, alas! it is not sought for, nor indeed expected from these Courts. And as the Reverend *Grosthead* said at *Rome*, when he saw all things ruled by Money, so may I say of the Courts under consideration, *O Money, Money, what wilt thou not do there?* As for the opprobrious Language prohibited by the *Canon*, we think it uncomely for any to use it, tho we dissent from the Ceremonies themselves.

SECT. IV.

Concerning Imposing of Ceremonies.

1. ALL Divine Ceremonies ordained by Christ, or his Apostles, we reverence, and religiously observe and keep, as they were delivered.

2. That any Church since their days, hath just power to make and ordain Divine Ceremonies, to be any necessary parts of the Worship of God, we see no ground to believe; much less, that such Ceremonies may lawfully be imposed under pain of Excommunication, Banishment, Imprisonment, Loss of Estate and Life. For tho it is certain, God has given power to the Rulers of the World, to make, change, or disannul Laws in point of Civil Government; yet we believe all the Power on Earth cannot make one Institute or Divine Ceremony in Religion. And therefore we cannot but think the Church of *England* erred from the Rule of Righteousness, in decreeing Rites and Ceremonies which God has not commanded.

3. For when we see how sharply some were reprehended by St. *Paul*, for bringing the Christian Churches in *Galatia* under some Legal Ceremonies, which once had a divine Original and Use in the Church of God, as *Invaders of the Liberty wherewith Christ had made them free*; averring also, *That if they were subject to them, Christ should profit them nothing. Gal.* 5. 1, 2. We can see no ground to free the Protestants from Sin, who either take

take up Scriptureleſs *Ceremonies* from the Papiſts, or invent *Ceremonies* themſelves; but leaſt of all, when they force Men, will they, nill they, to conform to ſuch *Ceremonies*, or elſe to be ejected, and delivered up to Satan. And ſurely it was very unreaſonable for her Biſhops to conſent to a Law, that pious Men, only diſſenting in theſe things from the Church of *England*, ſhould be baniſhed, or elſe hanged as Felons, without Benefit of the Clergy. And we humbly deſire, that the Severity of that Law may be conſidered and mitigated. *See the 35th of Elizabeth.*

4. But if it ſhall be ſaid, That the *Ceremonies* of the Church of *England*, (as the Sprinkling of Infants, the Sign of the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, bowing to the Altar, to name no more at preſent) are not ſinful; then how ſhall we be ever able to reprove a Papiſt, for uſing holy Water, bowing to the Image of Chriſt? *&c.*

Certainly, if we muſt ſubmit to the *Ceremonies* of the *Church* of *England*, in her preſent *Conſtitution*, we muſt ſubmit to theirs too, where they have power on their ſide to enforce them. But he that ſhall impartially conſider what a learned Proteſtant hath ſaid of the Sinfulneſs of that one *Ceremony* of the Sign of the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, in his Book entituled, *Againſt Symbolizing with Antichriſt in Ceremonies*, will ſee great cauſe to avoid touching with any ſuch Inventions, however they may be ſuppoſed to have had an harmleſs Uſe among *Chriſtians* at the firſt.

But who ſees not, that when ſuch *Ceremonies* have got the Reputation of Religion upon them, and are forced on by humane Laws, what incredible Miſeries they have brought upon the *Chriſtian* World? How have they lorded it over Kings and Kingdoms, over the Eſtates, Liberties and Lives of Chriſtians? Who ſees not, that being thus ſet up, they are ſometimes more ſet by, than ſincere Faith, and an holy Life? as if all true Religion (and *Loyalty* too) were only to be judged of according to Mens Submiſſion to thoſe Humane Innovations. For it is notorious, even in this our Land, that let a Man but conform to all the Ceremonies, he ſhall live honourably, let his *Life* be never ſo debauched almoſt: But let a Man refuſe theſe Ceremonies, out of conſcience to God, becauſe they are not from Heaven, then he is Envy's Mark, let his *Life* be never ſo juſt and harmleſs. Such Effects ſhould lead us to conſider what the Cauſes are.

And becauſe we are ſpeaking of Ceremonies, we crave leave to enquire, *What means the Ceremony of the Ring in Marriage?* Why are we forced not only to uſe it, but to uſe it *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghoſt?* The Church of *England* blames the Papiſts for ſaying Marriage is a Sacrament; but ſhall we then make a Sacrament of a Ring? Sure you make the Ring as ſacred in Marriage, as you make the Water in Baptiſm. Such Uſages as theſe, we fear, give the Papiſts too much cauſe to uſe this Speech, *A Proteſtant is but a Papiſt ſcar'd out of his Wits.*

It is not then any thing of Prejudice or Obſtinacy, which makes us to ſtand off from the *Communion of the Church of England*, but an unfeigned Deſire to ſerve God aright, and a godly Fear, leſt by touching with theſe unwritten Traditions, we ſhould bring our Souls under Guilt in the ſight of God. Howbeit, if any can convince us, that the *Church of England* is juſtifiable in theſe things here objected, we ſhall ſuſpect our ſelves to be miſtaken in other things, which we here mention not.

Now may it pleaſe the God of Heaven, to put it into the Hearts of the Guides of the *Church of England*, to conſider theſe things.

1. *That none of theſe Ceremonies about which we differ from them, are required of Chriſtians in the Holy Scriptures.* And that therefore,

2. *To enforce them by Excommunication and Penal Laws upon the Conſciences of Men, is more than God requires of you, or any Body elſe.*

And ſurely if the making theſe things neceſſary to our *Communion* were but removed, ſo that Things which are not delivered in the Word of God were left at liberty, we ſhould not ſtand at ſo great a diſtance from the *Church of England*, as now we do: For tho we are verily perſuaded, that theſe Things objected againſt by us are Errors, and therefore prudently to be amended; yet we believe the impoſing of them is a thouſand times more offenſive in the ſight of God, and more grievous to the Souls of Men, becauſe (as we conceive) God's Authority is then uſurped by Man, and Mens Fear towards him is then taught by the Precepts of Men.

And yet we know, and indeed muſt confeſs, that many Things, as to the more convenient performance of Religious Services in a Church-way, are left to the Prudence of the Church, guided therein

therein by the general Rules in the Word of God; and some Things also (which are not of the Essence of Christianity) will seem doubtful to some, and clear to others. And therefore there will be a continual Necessity of brotherly Forbearance one towards another, in some sinless Ceremonies, as many Things may be so esteemed, whilst not made the Boundaries of Communion, and forced upon Christians against their Consciences. For Example: tho Sitting be the most safe Gesture at the Lord's Table, because nearest to Christ's Example; yet if any in Humility, and of Devotion to God, think it their Duty to receive kneeling, this surely cannot justly offend any Christian. And thus also bowing at the Name of Jesus, being left at liberty, when, where, and upon what occasion the Conscience of a Christian may be most pressed to do it, need not offend any, tho it is apparent such bowing is not the meaning of the Text, *Phil.* 2. 10. And the same may be said of well-composed Prayers; so that still such Forms be used as a matter of Christian Liberty, and not imposed by Law as necessary.

And could Things be managed with such Moderation, (as certainly the State of the Inhabitants of this Land does much call for it) in a friendly and brotherly Spirit, 'tis hoped our Animosities would abate, and Charity would endear all that are upright towards God one towards another, tho labouring under many Weaknesses, or dark Circumstances. But whilst one Party stands up with a Sword in their hand, or with power to thrust Men into Goal, and rifle their Estates, unless they will all submit to their Will and Pleasure, not only without, but perhaps in some things against the Word of God, (*the pretended Rule to all Protestants in Matters of Religion*) this lays a Necessity upon all that are of Noble and truly Christian Spirits, to testify against such Cruelty, and unmanly Proceedings, and to assert the true Christian Doctrine and Liberty, and Christ's Sovereign Authority only, to make Laws for his Church, as such, altho for so doing they suffer the Loss of all Things which are dear to them in this World; and therewithal, to stand off from the Communion of such unreasonable Men, as have not learned to do to others, as they would have others to do to them under their differing Opinions, when in a state of Subjection to those who differ from them.

Thus much briefly of the Reaſons or Cauſes of our Separation. We will now conſider what Mr. *N. Taylor* brings to make good *Pædobaptiſm.* And the rather, becauſe he ſays he has defended Infant-Baptiſm both by Scripture and Reaſon.

Let us hear how he doth this.

Mr. NATHANIEL TAYLOR'S *Fourteen Arguments for Infant-Baptiſm, conſidered and anſwered.*

BEfore we anſwer his Arguments, we will take notice of ſome of his Conceſſions. And,

1. He ſaith, *Baptiſm of Water is not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* pag. 2.

2. He tells us, *St. Paul joins the Word of God with this Baptiſm, in order to the purifying Chriſt's Church, that acting on the Soul, and this terminating on the Body. And that St.* Peter's *Aſſertion is clear that it is not Water purifying the Fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God that ſaveth.* pag. 7.

3. He tells us alſo, *That the premiſing the Word* DISCIPLE (Matth. 28. 19.) *implies none to be capable of Baptiſm, who are not Diſciples of Chriſt, and Members of the Church.* pag. 10.

4. And further, *That Chriſt would have his Ordinances performed by an external Adminiſtration, wherein the ſubject might be in the neareſt capacity of underſtanding.* pag. 81, 82.

5. He grants, *That Childrens Baptiſm, and Church-Memberſhip, are not mentioned in the New Teſtament.* pag. 51.

From all which a Man may very fairly argue, and conclude againſt Infant-Baptiſm thus.

If Infants are undoubtedly ſaved without Baptiſm; and are Members of Chriſt's Church without Baptiſm, and that the Word of God muſt act upon the Soul in true Baptiſm, ſo as that the Subject of Baptiſm muſt have the anſwer of a good Conſcience: And

if

if none be capable of Baptiſm, till they be Diſciples of Chriſt, according to *Matth.* 28. 19. and ought to be in the neareſt capacity of underſtanding what is done in the external adminiſtration of Baptiſm. And if Infant-Church-Membership and Baptiſm be not mentioned in the New Teſtament; then Infants ought not to be baptized.

But all this is true, ſaith Mr. *Taylor*: Therefore I conclude Infants ought not to be baptized. And thus his Book (I will not ſay (as he) may be ſoon blown away; but it) may ſeem to be ſoon anſwered: And his learned Title very unſuitable. For how ſhall ΠΑΙΔΟΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ be ΟΡΘΟΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ, when it is not mention'd in the new Teſtament; can that be Orthodoxal Baptiſm which is not mentioned there? Sure this is incredible.

But let us hear his Arguments, by which he undertakes to *vindicate Infant-Baptiſm both by Scripture and Reaſon.*

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 1.

If our Chriſtian Privileges be as great as the Jews were, then our Children are rightly baptized: But our Chriſtian Privileges are as great as the Jews were: Therefore our Children are rightly Baptized.

ANSWER.

Becauſe Mr. *Taylor* ſays he offers his Reaſons for Infant-Baptiſm, in order to a compoſure of Differences, and I do believe he means as he ſays; I ſhall therefore endeavour to anſwer them with all Love and Sincerity, as becomes a Chriſtian. And, I ſay,

1. That upon a fair Diſtinction, both Propoſitions may be denied. For, if the Queſtion be of external Privileges only; then whether we reſpect outward Advantages in the World, or Rites and Ceremonies in the Church pertinent to Infants; the *Minor* is to be denied: for the *Jews* were under a ſure Promiſe of a fruitful Land, and external Peace and Glory, as a Nation, whilſt they did truly walk according to the Laws of God, of which Advantages their Children were partakers as well as others. But on the other ſide, the Chriſtian Church by how much ſhe is more faithful,

by

by ſo much the more is ſhe ſubject to Perſecution: As may be ſeen in the differing eſtate of the faithful Church at *Smyrna*, *Rev.* 2.8,9. and the unfaithful Church at *Laodicea*, *Rev.* 3.17. Or if we reſpect Rites and Ceremonies, then 'tis certain, even in the Judgment of all Chriſtians, the Jews had more Ceremonies belonging to their Infants, than belongs to Chriſtian Infants. For beſides the Rite of Circumciſion, there was an Offering to be offered for them, and they were to be preſented in the Temple, and to partake of the Paſſover, *Exod.* 12.47, 48. (and therefore Mr. *Taylor* does ill to deny it, *pag.* 92.) Whereas the *Pædobaptiſts* only contend for the external Rite of Baptiſm to belong to their Infants.

Luk. 2. 22, 23, 24. *Exod.* 13. 2. *Lev. c.* 12.

But if by the Word *Privileges* in the Argument be meant ſome higher thing than external Ceremonies, then the *Minor* is true: For as God was gracious to Infants in the Jewiſh Nation, as to the Buſineſs of Salvation: So is he ſuch to the Infants of every Chriſtian Nation in the World.

But if now you be diſpleaſed, becauſe I do not prefer, or at leaſt equalize Chriſtians Infants with Jewiſh Infants, in reſpect of external Ceremonies. Then let me freely tell you, that I do believe the Privileges of Chriſtians is greater than the Jews, even in this, that God accepts our Infants to his Grace, and to Glory, *without impoſing the Burthen of any Ceremony at all upon them.* For ſeeing he has by the Goſpel taken away that bloody Ceremony of Circumciſion, and by our Lord Chriſt declared Infants to have right to the Kingdom of Heaven, without impoſing any Ceremony upon them inſtead of Circumciſion, I ſay, herein our Privileges are greater than the Jews, and in this Senſe I confirm your *Minor*. But then *I deny the Conſequence of your Major:* For you may plainly ſee that our Chriſtian Privileges (when compared with the Jews) ſtand not in having external Ceremonies, but rather in being freed from them. Even as it cannot be doubted but that the Children of *Seth*, *Henoch*, and *Noah*, *&c.* had as great Privileges as the Jews, and yet it is certain [*and plainly confeſſed by Auguſtine*] that they had no Ceremony or ſign of Regeneration belonging to them that we read of. *Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib.* 15. *cap.* 16.

Thus your chief Fort being demoliſhed, what Reaſons you bring to defend it ſignifie nothing; however we ſhall meet with them in the following Arguments.

Mr.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 2.

Thoſe who were Circumciſed under the Law, may be baptized under the Goſpel: But Children were Circumciſed under the Law: Therefore they may be baptized under the Goſpel.

ANSWER.

1. I anſwer to the *Major*. If by [*Thoſe*] you mean all thoſe that were Circumciſed under the Law: Then the *Major* is not true. For firſt, all Male-Servants which were bought with Money, muſt *needs* be Circumciſed, they might not elſe dwell in the Family: (*Gen.* 17. 12, 13, 14. *Exod.* 12. 44, 48, 49.) But no ſuch impoſition is laid upon Families under the Goſpel, 1 *Cor.* 7.

2. If by [*Thoſe*] you mean Infants, then I deny your *Major*: For tho Infants were Circumciſed under the Law, it does not follow that Infants may be Baptized under the Goſpel: Nor do your Arguments, brought to make it good, prove it at all. For,

1. Tho Baptiſm ſucceeds Circumciſion as the Sacrament of initiation, yet it does not follow, that the ſame Perſons, or Perſons no otherwiſe qualified than the Infants of the Jews, or Servants bought with Money, are to be admitted to Baptiſm; becauſe Circumciſion belonged to the natural Seed of *Abraham* as ſuch, whether in the Covenant or no (as in the caſe of *Iſhmael*,) and to his Servants as ſuch. But Baptiſm being the Sacrament or waſhing of Regeneration, belongs to thoſe who are born from above (as ſuch); Hence 'tis ſaid, Gal. 3. 28. *We are Abraham's Seed, becauſe we are Chriſt's*, ſo, as to have *crucified the Fleſh with the Affections and Luſts:* Gal. 4. 24. And not that they are Chriſt's, becauſe they are *Abraham*'s Seed. This vaſt difference therefore between the Communicants of the Church Jewiſh, and the Church Chriſtian, ſhews a great difference between the carnal Ordinances of the Law, and the ſpiritual Ordinances of the Goſpel: ſo that it is no good arguing from Infants Right to the one, to their Right to the other.

2. You ſay our Children are *as capable of being Baptized, as the Jews were of being Circumciſed.* But this is denied: for the Jews had a Command to Circumciſe Infants, and that made them capable of that Ceremony; but without a Command none were capable

of it: For ſome Infants might be as capable of Circumciſion in reſpect of Strength, on the ſeventh Day, as others on the eighth Day; but the Command not empowering any to circumciſe till the eighth Day, made all Children that died before the eighth Day uncapable of Circumciſion. Again, you will not ſay that any Man, as ſuch only, is capable of Baptiſm, becauſe you grant they muſt firſt be Diſciples, and, as ſuch, baptized. Nor will you ſay, that all Infants, as ſuch only, may be baptized, becauſe you do not think God has required the Infants of the Turks to be baptized. So then, unleſs you can ſhew that God has required our Infants to be baptized, they have no capacity for it. We conclude then, whatever may be urged as a Capacity for Baptiſm, yet without a Command from God, to baptize our Infants, is meer Will-Worſhip and Preſumption.

3. You ſay, *That the Precept of receiving Parent and Child into Covenant ſtands unrepealed to this day.* But if by receiving into *Covenant*, you mean a receiving to the Duties of the *Covenant*, what you ſay is not true; for the *Covenant of Circumciſion* is repealed. Gal. 5. 2. *Behold, I* Paul *ſay unto you, If ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing.* And there was never any *Covenant*, but the *Covenant of Circumciſion*, which obliged Parents to bring their Infants to the *Ceremonies* of Religion: So then Infants are not under the Burthen of any Ceremonies of Religion at this day. I marvel you ſhould here ſay, *There is no Countermand of the ancient Jewiſh Practice of receiving Children to Circumciſion.* Either the Printer has wrong'd you, or elſe you hold the Jews are yet bound to circumciſe their Infants.

4. You argue from *Chriſt's being propoſed as Mediator of a better Covenant*, that therefore this great Privilege (you mean, bringing Infants to Ceremonies of Religion) *is not repealed.* But the Truth is far otherwiſe; for the Covenant of Chriſt as Mediator, is therefore better than the Covenant of the Law, becauſe he has taken theſe Ceremonies out of the way, and accepts poor Infants without any other Ceremony inſtead of them; yea, the Covenant is therefore better to Believers themſelves, in that they are obliged but to a very few Ceremonies, whilſt the Jews laboured under a burthenſom Yoke of many Ceremonies. And if your way of arguing were good, it would prove, that the Goſpel is worſe to Believers, than the Law was to the adult Jews, becauſe they had abundance of Religious Privileges, to wit, Ceremonies, and

Belie-

Believers have but a very few. Now who would think, that wiſe and good Men ſhould thus grope at Noon-day?

5. You quote *Acts* 2. 38, 39. and ſay, that this Text expreſly avers your Concluſion. But it is certain, the Promiſe there, is not of bringing Infants to any Ceremonies, and ſo does not at all favour your Concluſion; for the Promiſe being of the pouring out of the Gifts of the Holy-Ghoſt, according to the Prophecy of *Joel*, concerns not Infants in Infancy, ſaith Dr. *Jer. Taylor*. And as for the Precept in the Text, [to wit, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you,*] 'tis as certain that concerns not Infants; for Infants are juſt Perſons, which need no Repentance, and conſequently as little need the Baptiſm of Repentance. I rather therefore adhere to Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, than to Mr. *Nath. Taylor* in this Caſe; and I find that *Eraſmus* and *Diodate* do expound this Text as we do.

6. Now, Sir, your great Strait ſeems to be this: You think the Children of Heathens have as great Privileges as we allow to the Infants of Chriſtians. Let me anſwer freely; I do believe, that through the Grace of Chriſt their Infants, dying ſuch, are in as ſure a capacity for Salvation as our Infants. And why ſhould this offend, that ſeeing Infants are equally concluded under Sin in the firſt *Adam*, God ſhould have equally Mercy upon them in the ſecond *Adam*. Nay, does not Mr. *Taylor* himſelf tell us, *p.* 4. *That it's dreadful to believe, that all Infants which die unbaptized, are damned.* And that any of them ſhall be damned, he cannot prove, ſeeing he ſays, *He cannot implead them of Sin, in not being baptized, being not capable of deſiring it.* Well, I thank him for this, and ſhall requite him by granting, Chriſtians Infants are more happy in ſome gracious reſpects, than the Infants of the Heathen, being the Seed of many Prayers, and piouſly devoted therein to Almighty God from the Womb, and have the Advantage of an early Education in the Chriſtian Religion, that they may be as timely baptized as may be: On the other ſide, the Infants of the Heathens are perhaps devoted to Idols, as the Jews did ſometimes devote theirs to *Moloch*. But yet, as we do not think that God ſent the Jews Infants to burn in Hell, becauſe their Parents burnt them to *Moloch*; ſo neither ought we to think, that he will puniſh the Infants of the Heathen with Devils, becauſe their Parents devoted them to Idols; for as for poor Infants, what have they done?

7. You anſwer not our Objections, by ſaying, *The Covenant of Grace*, Gen. 17. 10, 13. *is permanent to the World's end*, &c. For tho this were true, yet that the Ceremonies which there accompany that Covenant, were to continue to the World's End, and ſhould pertain to Infants to the World's End, you neither believe your ſelf, nor can any Man prove, that any Ceremonies by Order from Chriſt ſhould belong to Infants to the World's end, ſeeing it is granted, that Infant-Baptiſm is not mentioned in the New Teſtament. And if I yield you your five Conſiderations following, *pag.* 33. I do not ſee that you gain any thing as to the Point in queſtion; I therefore proceed.

8. I think you miſtake, where you write that we ſay, *Thoſe that had Right to Circumciſion were a ſpiritual Seed*; for we know that the Carnal Seed had Right to it: What therefore you would build upon this Miſtake falls of it ſelf. But whereas you would infer, that Baptiſm, as well as Circumciſion, belongs to the carnal Seed, it is certainly a great Error. It is true, ſome that are Hypocrites may come to Sacred Baptiſm, but then they profeſs (at leaſt) to be otherwiſe, and are not admitted as Hypocrites, nor as Men only, (as you ſeem to urge, *Numb.* 2, *p.* 34.) but as they declare themſelves Chriſtians, or ſpiritual. And therefore it is ſaid of the whole Church, *Ye are all the Sons of God by Faith in Chriſt Jeſus*; *for as many as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.* Gal. 3. 26, 27. And again, Col. 2. *Ye are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt.* [*Therefore*, Rom. 6.] *we are buried with him in Baptiſm.* And beſides this, your Church makes Baptiſm a viſible Sign of an inward or ſpiritual Grace; and does affirm of all whom ſhe admits to Baptiſm, that *they are regenerate, and born anew:* Which ſhews that in this Point we agree, that the inward Work of Grace ſhould be in all that are baptized.

9. I grant, that *Jeremiah* and *John Baptiſt* were ſanctified, or ſeparated to God from the Womb, the one to be a Prophet, the other to be the Fore-runner of our Lord Chriſt; yet I deny, that theſe extraordinary Caſes are to be made the Rules for us to baptize by. God knows what we will be from our Birth to our Death; but theſe Things are hid from us. Things revealed and commanded belong to us. We may not preſume to think either of Men or Infants above what is written; to ſay, this is ſanctified from the Womb, and that not; this is a Believer, and that

not,

not, &c. But ſhew us a Rule to baptize Infants, and we will diſpute no further.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 3.

Thoſe who are within the Covenant of Grace, may be baptized: But Children are within the Covenant of Grace: Therefore Children may be baptized.

ANSWER.

1. The *Major* being taken univerſally, for all that are in the Covenant of Grace, then it is to be denied; for God never made that the Rule of Baptizing. Nay, when Circumciſion was in the greateſt uſe, yet all that were in the Covenant of Grace were not to be circumciſed. Such were the many Thouſands of Male Infants, who died before they were eight days old; theſe were in Covenant, and their Salvation as ſure as if they had been circumciſed. The Females alſo were in Covenant, yet not to be circumciſed. If you ſay they were not capable, learned Authors tell you otherwiſe, and name ſome Nations who circumciſe both Sexes to this day. By this you ſee your *Major* runs upon a falſe Suppoſition.

2. And if by thoſe who are within the Covenant, you mean ſome of thoſe, then your Argument comes ſhort of the Queſtion, viz. *Whether all that are in the Covenant of Grace may be baptized?* But let us try your *Minor*. The *Covenant of Grace* hath two parts, 1. *A Declaration of God's Mercy in Mans Redemption*; in this reſpect I grant, Infants are within the *Covenant of Grace*. 2. *A Declaration of Mans Duty in point of Faith and Obedience*; in this Sence I deny Infants to be in the *Covenant*. Let us hear therefore how you confirm your *Minor*.

3. You ſay, *It is verified, in that Baptiſm is the Seal of the Covenant now, as Circumciſion was under the Law, &c. And therefore thoſe who are under the participation of the Covenant, may be admitted to the Seal*, &c.

4. But why do our Brethren of the *Church of England* ſpeak of the Seal in the Singular? They uſed to tell us, the Covenant has two Seals, to wit, Baptiſm, and the Table of the Lord. And

I will abide by it, that the Lord's Table is as truly a Seal of the Covenant, as Baptiſm. Yet you deny Infants this Seal, tho you know when they firſt baptized Infants, they alſo brought them to the Lord's Table, and this cuſtom continued ſix hundred Years. But I deny your Conſequence; it follows not, that all that are in Covenant may have the Seal of Baptiſm. And you tell us, *That God's Grace is univerſal*, pag. 37. yet you will not ſay that Baptiſm is univerſal; it belongs but to thoſe who reſtipulate, and enter into Covenant upon the Terms of Faith and Repentance. Acts 8. 12. *When they believed*, &c. *they were baptized, both Men and Women.* And here the City of *Samaria* generally received the Goſpel, and yet not an Infant baptized.

5. But how ſhall I underſtand you, where you ſay, *That Children never excluded themſelves from the Covenant of Grace, becauſe not actual Unbelievers, and none but ſuch were ejected?* And where you preſently ſay, *They have the Covenant belonging to them with their believing Parents?* Have Infants no benefit by the Covenant of Grace, unleſs their Parents believe? Alas! poor Infants! But ſure God does not exclude Infants from the Covenant of Grace, made for Mankind in Chriſt, becauſe their Parents believe not; No, I will hold to your firſt Saying, *That none but actual Unbelievers are rejected.*

6. That the Holineſs mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is only Legitimacy, or Lawfulneſs of Birth, you would have to be only a Gloſs of the Anabaptiſts. But how can you fairly take it for any other, ſeeing it is taken immediately from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Husband, as the word [*elſe*] being rightly referred, makes evident. Upon which Conſideration, *Eraſmus* expounds this place expreſly as we do, yet he was a Pœdobaptiſt. And *Auſtin* long before him ſaid, *Whatever that Holineſs is*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *it is certain it is not of Power to make Chriſtians, or remit Sins.* Sir, if you conſider the Scope of the place, 1 *Cor.* 7. you will find, ſome in that Church were in doubt whether they might dwell with their unbelieving Yokefellows. St. *Paul* reſolves the Doubt in the Affirmative, and gives this Reaſon for it: The unbelieving Huſband is ſanctified to the believing Wife; and if he were not ſo, their Children were unclean, but he being ſanctified, their Children were clean; for Marriage is honourable among all, and the Marriage-Bed undefiled, *Heb.* 13. Therefore let not the Husband put away his Wife, nor the Wife depart from her Husband.

7. What

7. What you say further to this Argument, being built upon a wrong Supposition, *viz.* That we deny Infants to be within the Covenant of Grace, falls of it self. For we say with you, till they by actual Unbelief exclude themselves, the Grace of God extends to them, as well as to others, in respect of their Salvation.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 4.

Those who have right to the Blessings of the Covenant, have right to Baptism: But Children have right to the Blessings of the Covenant: Therefore they have right to Baptism.

ANSWER.

1. This Argument is upon the matter the same with the former, and therefore upon the former distinction the *Major* is denied: for tho Infants have right to all the Blessings of the Covenant which they have need of, yet they have no right to the Duties of the Covenant, which they have no need of, because God requires no Duties of them.

2. And tho you say, that *our Concession (that Infants are within the Covenant of Grace) proves that Infants have right to all the Privileges of the Covenant*; Yet this is contrary to your own Judgment, for you your selves deny them right to the Lord's Table, and indeed all other Privileges, as much as we do, except your Crossing and Sprinkling them. What you say further here, is often repeated, and will be considered in the following Arguments; and if I repeat in my Answers, you have compelled me.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 5.

Those who are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God, are capable of Baptism: But Children are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God: Therefore Children are capable of Baptism.

ANSWER.

1. This Argument, (as most of the rest) may be retorted thus;

They

They that are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God, are capable of the Lord's Table: But Infants are capable of being engaged in the Covenant, &c. *Ergo*, They are capable of the Lord's Table. Which ſufficiently ſhews the unſoundneſs of your Argument. But let us examine the proof of your *Major*.

2. To this purpoſe you tell us, *That Infants are in the Power of their Parents, to diſpoſe of, as to Temporals and Spirituals.* And your Reaſon is, becauſe Parents are obliged to take the greateſt care imaginable of their Childrens Souls, for their Education in the Fear of God. Well, now I ſee why you uſe not the word *Infants*, but *Children*, all along in your Arguments: you know that Infants, ſuch as you Sprinkle, are not capable of any Education at all. They cannot be taught the Fear of God. They then cannot be engaged in Covenant by the Means of Education, nor can they in that State be brought up in his Service, in reſpect of Religious Ordinances: So that inſtead of proving, you have loſt your *Minor*.

3. What you argue, from *Deut.* 29.11,12,14. will never prove that Infants are capable of entering into Covenant with God in their own Perſons; but that their Parents did engage to bring them up in the Laws of God; and what this is to the purpoſe, I do not imagine. Is it therefore my Duty to baptize my Children, without a Command from God to do ſo, meerly becauſe by the Covenant of Grace, and Rules of Chriſtianity, I am to do my beſt to teach my Children the Fear of the Lord? This is very inconſequent, and will as much oblige me to bring my Infants to the Lord's Table, as I have ſhewed. This laſt you will not allow, becauſe God requires it not; and for the ſame Reaſon I refuſe to bring my Infants to Baptiſm, tho I believe it my Duty to do all that I can to engage them in Covenant with God, by Chriſtian Education in the Fear of God, that they may ſerve him in all his Commands and Ordinances blameleſs.

4. Wherefore in Anſwer to your Argument: If by Infants being capable of being engaged in Covenant with God, you mean the Parents engagement to educate them in the Fear of God, &c. Then I deny your *Major*, and ſay, Thoſe who are only capable thus to be engaged with God in Covenant, are not capable of Baptiſm. But if you mean, a perſonal and actual entring into Covenant with God, then I deny your *Minor*, and all the Experience of the World confutes you.

5. You

5. You shall never be able to prove that Infants are capable of Fasting and Prayer, as they are Duties, tho you seem to affirm it; and what tho they did fast (so did the Beasts) and that Fast was pleasing to God, yet nothing hence arises to prove that either Infants, or the Cattle, *Jonah* 3. performed any Duty to God, nor that they are therefore to be brought to the participation of Baptism, nor any other Religious Ordinance, without Order from God to do it. Yet if a Man were disposed to Syllogize from hence after your manner, he might as strongly plead for one Error, as you do for another.

6. The Capacity of Jewish Children for Circumcision, or other Rites of the Law, depended chiefly on the Will of God to order it so. Prove that it is his Will to have Infants baptized, and we will not mention their Incapacity. If it be not his Will, wherefore is it done? Who has required it?

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 6.

Those who are Members of Christ's Church, ought to be baptized: But Children are Members of Christ's Church: Therefore Children ought to be baptized.

ANSWER.

If by the Church of Christ, you mean all that since the Death of Christ, shall be saved; then I deny the *Major*. For the Infants of the poor *Indians* may be saved, yet in your Judgment they ought not to be baptized. But if by the Church of Christ, you mean only such as are in the actual Profession of the Gospel: Then I deny the *Minor*, and retort your Argument thus.

1. Those who are Members of the Church, ought to continue in the Apostles Doctrine, and in Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. But *&c. Ergo, &c.* The *Major* is proved, *Acts* 2. 41. 1 *Cor.* 10. *They continued stedfastly in the Apostle's Doctrine, and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. We being many, are one Body and one Bread, for we are all partakers of that one Bread.* These things were spoken of the whole Church, which was in these Places engaged in the actual profession of the Gospel. Now see how you can defend your self against my *Minor*, and

therein you will eaſily ſee the infirmity of your own.

2. But to prove your *Minor*, you ſay, *The Children of the Jews were with their Parents Church-Members under the Law, and that Law is not yet repealed.* But if by their Church-membership you mean, their Right to, and their Parents Act in bringing them to Ceremonies in Religion, the contrary is true. The Covenant of Circumciſion being repealed, as it was an Obligation to the Children of *Iſrael*, and never made with any Nation ſince; nor any other Covenant extant where ſuch things are impoſed upon Infants.

3. That the Children of converted Jews, loſt not their Privileges, is not true, if by Privileges you intend Ceremonies; but if by Privileges you mean a being delivered from the Law of Ceremonies, then I grant it. And it is certainly a greater Privilege that Children are under a declared Right to the Kingdom of God by Chriſt, and his gracious bleſſing a part of them, as a Pledg for the whole, than if he had ordained a Law to baptize them in order thereunto. And it is alſo certain, that the Jewiſh Church-ſtate, being diſſolved upon the Death of Chriſt, and the Goſpel-Church, confirmed in the Gift of Tongues, &c. No Perſon could rightly ſtand a Member of the Jewiſh Church, which was the only Church that ever had command from God to bring their Infants to Rites of Religion.

4. You ſtill urge, *that the Gentiles had equal Privileges with the Jews.* And I grant they have greater Privileges, but not in Rites and Ceremonies, but rather in being accepted without them, as touching their Infants, and with a very few as touching themſelves. But you ſay further, *That the Children of Parents who did not believe, were rejected; therefore the Children of believing Parents, or Gentiles, are Church-Members.* And here, I confeſs, I know not how to reconcile you to your ſelf, where you ſay, *None are excluded from the Covenant of Grace but actual Unbelievers,* pag. 26. Sure the Son ſhall not dye for the Sin of the Parents, ſo as to go to Hell with them. Shall not the Judg of all the Earth do Right?

5. You ſay, *Children are either Members of the viſible Church of Chriſt, or elſe are viſibly of Satan's Kingdom, there is no Medium between theſe two.*

Surely I did not think Mr. *Taylor* had been of this Opinion! No Papiſt can ſay worſe of poor Infants. Here you condemn many thouſands of Infants; God give you a better Underſtanding. Are Infants of *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Indians* all of the viſible Kingdom of Sa-

Satan? No, I will believe my Saviour, who ſaith, *It is not the will of his Heavenly Father that one of theſe little ones ſhould periſh*, Mat. 18. 14. And ſure I am, that none are truly of Satan's Kingdom, but ſuch as are his Subjects. For he has no right over any by Creation, and Purchaſe, as God and Chriſt have. Now it being clear, that Infants are none of Satan's Subjects, it muſt needs be very injurious, to ſay they are viſibly of his Kingdom. But being Created by God, and Redeemed by Chriſt, and never offended in their own Perſons, it is rational to think they are in God's Favour, as it appears the Infants of the *Ninevites* were, *Jonah* 4. In his gracious Arms we ſhall therefore leave them, and proceed.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 7.

Thoſe who are Diſciples of Chriſt may be baptized: But Children are Diſciples of Chriſt: Therefore Children may be baptized.

ANSWER.

1. The *Minor* is denied. Infants are not Diſciples of Chriſt, neither does God and Chriſt own them for ſuch, *as you affirm.* But you bring *Acts* 15. 1, 2, 10. to prove it, and ſay, *That the Yoak which the Jews would have laid upon the new converted Gentiles, was Circumciſion, which pertained to Children who were Circumciſed the eighth day, and yet it is laid too upon the Diſciples Necks.* But Sir, do you think this to be rational, that becauſe the Jews would have laid the Yoak of Circumciſion on the Necks of the Diſciples, that therefore all were Diſciples upon whom they would have laid that Yoak? ſure this is a very unlawful Conſequence: No better than this; You would lay the Yoak of Croſſing and Sprinkling upon Infants, therefore all are Infants upon whom you would lay the Yoak of Croſſing and Sprinkling. Again, they that were preſerved in the Ark of *Noah* were Men and Women: Therefore all that were preſerved in the Ark of *Noah* were Men and Women. You may eaſily ſee theſe Conſequences are very untrue, and verily ſo is yours. For tho the falſe Apoſtles would have laid the Yoak of Circumciſion upon the Necks of the Diſciples, yet all were not Diſciples whom they would have Circumciſed: for 'tis ſaid, *They taught the Brethren, except they were Circumciſed*, &c. *they could not*

be ſaved. But you cannot imagine that they taught Infants.

If *Acts* 15. be diligently read, it will expound it ſelf; for *verſ.* 19. the Diſciples are ſaid to be ſuch as from among the Gentiles were turned to God. And all that are called Diſciples, *verſ.* 10. are called Brethren, and as ſuch they are written unto by the Aſſembly, *verſ.* 23. And the Epiſtle is ſaid to be read to all the Multitude (meaning of the Diſciples,) who thereupon are ſaid to rejoice for the Conſolation: Sure theſe were no Infants.

2. But you ſay, *They are Diſciples in that; tho Man cannot teach them, yet God can, and may.* Well, I thank you for your Ingenuity. It is true (as you ſay) Man cannot teach, or make Infants Diſciples; and then to be ſure, they are not intended by our Saviour to be made Diſciples, by what he ſays in your Text, *Mat.* 28. 19. For all that are to be made Diſciples, by that Commiſſion, are to be made ſuch by Men: So that you are evidently beſides your Text, in all that you ſay to this Argument, and you are beſide your own Expoſition of your Text alſo, which I will here ſet down, as you give it, *pag.* 10. πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε, *Going to Diſciple all Nations, inſtruct them in the Principles of my Religion; and then being Diſciples, baptize them: So that there is a Diſcipleſhip pre-exiſtent to Baptiſm; and indeed the premiſing the Word DISCIPLE, implies none to be capable of Baptiſm, who are not Diſciples of Chriſt, and Members of his Church.* Theſe are your Words. 'Tis true, you ſay Infants will be proved to be Diſciples. But ſurely, not by ſaying as you do here, that God can make them Diſciples, or teach them: For it is no good arguing from what God can do, to ſay he has done it, or will do it. For God can, of the Stones in the Street, raiſe up Children unto *Abraham*, but I may not therefore ſay the Stones in the Street are the Children of *Abraham.* You ſay indeed, that God hath given ſeveral inſtances of his teaching ſeveral from the Womb, but you can neither name the Perſons, nor ſhew us what he taught them; however if you could, ſuch miraculous Operations are not given for general Rules. God once taught a dumb Aſs to ſpeak, and to reprove a Prophet; but it would be bad arguing from this inſtance, that Aſſes are Diſciples: And yet this is a clearer inſtance of God's teaching the Aſs, than you can give of his teaching any Infant.

3. But ſeeing you put Infants Diſcipleſhip upon the account of God's teaching them, you muſt have ſome competent ground to believe that he has miraculouſly taught them, before you baptize them;

them; or else you destroy your Exposition of the Text, which avers, *That there is a Discipleship pre-existent to Baptism.* And when you shall shew me the Infant whom God hath taught, or made a Disciple, I believe I shall not oppose your Baptizing that Infant, and this is as much as you can desire.

4. But you say further, *That God hath promised to teach Children.* What, Sir, in their Infancy? Let us see your Proofs; *Isa.* 54. 13. *All thy Children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the Peace of thy Children.* John 6. 45. *It is written in the Prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every Man therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Certainly had you read those Texts with their Coherence, and considered, that our Saviour himself in the latter expounds the former, you would never have imagined, that God here promises to teach any Infants, much less all the Infants in the Christian Nations; for it is very apparent, they that are taught according to these Scriptures, *have heard and learned of the Father, so as to come to Christ.* And indeed the meaning is, that God speaking to us by his Son, (who is very God, 1 *John* 5.) had now made good that gracious Promise, *Isa.* 54. 13. *All thy Children shall be taught of the Lord.* But you have another Text, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy-Ghost as well as we?* Now he that reads this place, will easily see, that the Persons here spoken of were only such as were assembled to hear *Peter, in whatsoever they should be commanded of God; and that the Holy-Ghost fell on all that heard the Word.* Which place therefore can with no shew of Reason be brought, to prove that Infants are taught of God. However, when you shall find an Infant, that has *received the Holy-Ghost, as well as the Apostles*; then for my part I shall not forbid Water, that you should baptize him, provided you first bebaptized your self.

5. You will have Infants to be Disciples, because *Christ* (you say) *commands the receiving of them in his Name*; and you quote *Luke* 18. 16, 17. *Mat.* 19. 13. *Luke* 9. 47. I have carefully read all these places, but can find no *Command* to receive Infants in the Name of Christ, much less to receive them by Baptism. It is true, *Christ called a little Child unto him, and said, Whosoever shall receive this Child in my Name, receiveth me.* Now this Child was able to know what Christ said, and is no fit Instance to prove an Infant of eight days old to be a Disciple of Christ; neither does

this

this Text call this Child a Diſciple, but the Diſciples are diſtinguiſhed from it. And yet it (and ſo any little Child) may be a good Precedent even to Diſciples, to learn Humility and Simplicity by; and ſo may a Lamb or a Dove ſerve to teach us to be humble and harmleſs, yet they are not therefore Diſciples. Neither can the receiving this Child, (or any other in like caſe) be underſtood of receiving them by Baptiſm; for then you may read the place thus, *Whoſoever baptizeth a Child in my Name, baptizeth me*; but this is both falſe and abſurd. And beſides, he that is baptized, may be rather ſaid to receive Chriſt, than he that baptizeth, in that Action. Or would you make our Saviour to ſay, He that baptizeth an Infant in my Name, receiveth me? If ſo, I would know by what Authority you take the word, *receiveth*, for baptizing in the firſt place, and in the ſecond for ſomething elſe. Surely, if to baptize an Infant in the Name of Chriſt, be a receiving of Chriſt, it's an eaſy thing to receive Chriſt, eſpecially for the Prieſt, who pretends to baptize Infants daily. But ſure it is as much the Duty of other Chriſtians to receive Children in the Name of Chriſt, as the Prieſts; for the Word is, *Whoſoever ſhall receive this Child in my Name*; and therefore it cannot be meant of baptizing them, and then theſe Scriptures prove not your Argument at all.

6. You urge, that Infants are Members of Earthly Kingdoms, and I grant it; and alſo I grant, that they belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, and ſo are of the Univerſal Church: But this proves not that they are Diſciples at all; for the Infants of Heathens are Members of Kingdoms, and may go to Heaven, and yet you think they are no Diſciples for all that. And if Infants may in ſome Sence be ſaid to be God's Servants, *Pſal.* 119. 91. yet this proves not that they are Diſciples; for all Creatures, as well ſenſitive, vegetative, as rational, are ſaid to be his Servants, yet all Creatures are not Chriſt's Diſciples.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 8.

To whom Chriſt grants Impoſition of Hands, to them belongs Baptiſm: But to Children Chriſt grants Impoſition of Hands: Therefore to them belongs Baptiſm.

ANSWER.

1. If the *major* Propoſition be taken univerſally, that to whomſoever Chriſt granted impoſition of Hands (or touching) in any caſe, that to them belongs Baptiſm, then the *Major* is not true; for he touched or put his hand upon the dead, yet Baptiſm belongs not to the dead, *Luke* 7. 14. If it be ſaid, Chriſt touched the Bier, not the Dead; I anſwer: He touched the Childrens Cloaths, when he took them in his Arms; but he took the dead Damſel by the hand, and ſaid, *Talitha, cumi, Damſel, I ſay unto thee, Ariſe.* Mark 5. 41. Thus much to the *Major*; now to the *Minor.*

2. If by laying on of hands, you underſtand that which by Chriſt's Doctrine, *Heb.* 6. 2. is made a ſtanding Ordinance in his Church, and in order next to Baptiſm, as is evident you do; then I deny your *Minor*: For that Ordinance was not yet inſtituted, nor uſeful, becauſe the End of it was not yet to be received; for the Spirit of Promiſe was not yet given, nor as yet to be given, becauſe *Jeſus* was not yet glorified, *John* 7. Wherefore your Miſinterpretation of *Mat.* 19. 13, 14, 15. is injurious to Truth, and would prefer theſe Infants to the Apoſtles, in the reception of the Firſt-fruits of the Spirit, unleſs you think Chriſt laid hands on the Children, without obtaining the End or Effect of the Service. So then it's clear, that this laying on of hands, or touching Infants, (for ſo it is expreſſed both by St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*) cannot with any fairneſs be underſtood of that laying on of hands which follows Baptiſm, and therefore is no Proof at all for your *Minor.*

3. The Church of *England* does not believe that Infants are fit Subjects for laying on of hands, and therefore does not underſtand this Text, *Mat.* 19. of that laying on of hands which follows Baptiſm; neither does Mr. *Taylor* himſelf believe that Confirmation belongs to Infants: If otherwiſe, they are very unfaithful, in that they were never known to lay hands upon any one Infant for confirmation, as I can hear of. But how comes it to paſs that Mr. *Taylor* will baptize Infants, when yet he confeſſes their Baptiſm is not mentioned in the New Teſtament, and yet not plead for their Confirmation, *till they be capable to own their Covenant made in Baptiſm*, when yet he pretends, (tho I dare ſay he believes

believes it not) that Text, *Mat.* 19. 13, *&c.* is expreſs for that laying on of hands which follows Baptiſm, to be granted to Chriſt to Infants ? *pag.* 56.

4. Mr. *Taylor* ſays, *That Chriſt confirmed, or laid hands on the Baptized.* I ſhall entreat him to make this plain, for I would gladly ſee it well proved ; however, I am ſure his Doctrine orders it to be done, and that's ſufficient. What you ſay further here, is either what we oppoſe not, or what is anſwered elſewhere, ſave only your laſt Particular, which now we ſhall conſider.

5. *Their coming to Chriſt* (ſay you) *is their becoming his Diſciples or Proſelites : Suffer them,* πρὸς ἐλθεῖν *to be Proſelites to me.* If to this I ſhould anſwer, with *Tertullian, Veniant ergo dum adoleſcunt, &c.* Let them come therefore when they are grown up ; it will be thought too little, tho God knows (how haſty ſoever Men are to get them ſprinkled) they are ſlow enough to bring them to Chriſt, when they are capable to be taught ; *I* will therefore anſwer further : Do you think that when Infants are brought to a Prieſt to be ſprinkled and croſſed, that then they are brought to Chriſt ? Or can Chriſtians no other way bring their *Infants* to Chriſt ? Or do no *Infants* belong to Chriſt, but thoſe who are ſo brought ? Theſe Things will not be aſſerted, *I* think, yet let us go as far as we can by the Light of the Text. By this Example of Chriſt, *I* think the Miniſters of Chriſt may lawfully pray for a Bleſſing in behalf of all the Infants of thoſe that ſhall deſire it; and that it is well done in thoſe Parents that do deſire the Prayers of the Church, or her Miniſters, for their Infants. And this is as much as can be fairly urged from this Text, as imitable for us. For the touching by our Saviour's hands, may be a Point too high for us, unleſs we will alſo touch the Dead, *&c.* which (*I* hope) is not written for our Example. But now if the Miniſter will needs baptize my Child, becauſe *I* bring it into the Congregation, and deſire Prayer to be made to God for his Bleſſing upon it, he herein goes beyond the Example of Chriſt, and beyond the Text, and therefore there I muſt leave him, his πρὸς ἐλθεῖν notwithſtanding. For προσήλυτος *ex verbo* προσέρχομαι, *quod eſt advenio quoniam veniebant, eſt Ethnicis ad Judaiſmum,* ſaith the Learned, and I think Infants cannot change their Religion, nor was it fit to call an Infant of a Jew, a Proſelite when it was brought to Circumciſion ; and conſequently as improper to call the Child of a Chriſtian a Proſelite. However, all that can lawfully be done

to

to proſelite an Infant (if you will needs have that Term uſed) is but to devote them to Chriſt by Prayers for his Bleſſing, but not a Syllable for baptizing them.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 5.

If the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant, then it entitles them to Baptiſm: But the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant: Therefore the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to Baptiſm.

ANSWER.

1. The Conſequence of the *Major* may well be denied: for tho it ſhould be ſome ways true, that the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant, yet it follows not, that it entitles them to the performance of, or ſubmiſſion to the Things which they underſtand not, nor are able to perform. And whither would ſuch a Conſequence lead us, if we ſhould follow it? What Duty ſhould not Infants be entitled to, as well as to Baptiſm? But let us ſee whether the *Minor* be well proved; you quote *Acts* 2. and think it a clear place to prove that the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant. But this Text ſays not a word to that purpoſe; for *Peter* derives the Title both of Parents and Children from the Promiſe of God: and builds the Title of all the Called of the Lord, and of them that were afar off alſo, upon the Promiſe of God, and not upon the Faith of *Abraham* himſelf. Beſides, the Promiſe here is of the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore not pertinent to Infants, as I have ſhewed: Here is therefore no proof at all of your *Minor*. I think it were better to ſay, that by Faith a Chriſtian knows his Child has an intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, than that his Faith entitles his Child to it. I fear this *Minor* is a very dangerous Aſſertion, and that partly becauſe the Conſequence of ſuch an Opinion is to ſhut out all Infants from the Covenant of Grace, who have not faithful Parents to entitle them to it: And in truth it ſeems to ſwell with too much boldneſs, and carnal preſumption; but I ſpare you.

2. The Faith of the Jews and Proſelites did not entitle their Children to the Covenant of Grace; but they themſelves being

incorporate into that Church-State, their Children, by expreſs Command from God, had a Title to legal Priviledges: but the Covenant of Grace (for that's it we diſpute, tho you leave out the Word *Grace* in your Argument) extended to Infants by God's free Redemption, which he purpoſed for them, in Chriſt, from the Foundation of the World; or elſe what ſhall become of the many thouſands of Infants of Unbelievers?

3. You can never prove, that the Faith of the *Jaylor*, or *Lydia* either, did entitle their Infants to the Covenant, for you cannot prove they had any Children. And it is ſo exceeding plain, that all that were baptized in theſe two Families were Believers, that I wonder much that you ſhould ſay, that on the believing of the *Jaylor* and *Lydia*, the whole Families were baptized. Pray read *Acts* 16. 32. to the end, and you will find that they that were baptized, were actual Believers, and capable of being conſolated by the Apoſtles.

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 10.

Thoſe who are capable of the Kingdom of Heaven, are capable of Baptiſm: But Children are capable of the Kingdom of Heaven: Therefore Children are capable of Baptiſm.

ANSWER.

1. The *Major* being taken univerſally, for all that may go to Heaven, it may very well be denied; for Mr. *Taylor* dare not deny a Capacity of Salvation to ſome of the Infants of the Jews, and yet Mr. *Taylor* himſelf does not think they are capable of Baptiſm; for he makes the Faith of the Parents neceſſary to the entitling them to Baptiſm, which in this Caſe is wanting.

2. That the greater includes the leſs, is not univerſally true; for Women have a capacity to go to Heaven, yet they have no capacity to be Biſhops, which is leſs than going to Heaven. Infants are not capable of the Lord's Table, which is leſs than to go to Heaven. Indeed, this Argument being admitted to be good, would bring Infants to all Privileges in the Church-Militant, as well as to Baptiſm; for thus a Man might argue: Thoſe who are capable of all the Privileges of the Church Triumphant, are capable

capable of all the Privileges of the Church Militant, (for the greater includes the leſs): But Infants are capable of all Privileges in the Church Triumphant; *Ergo, &c.* And if it be *unreaſonable* (as you ſay it is) *to deny the external Sign, to thoſe to whom Chriſt hath granted the internal Grace*; pray, why are you ſo unreaſonable, as to deny your Infants the Sign of the Lord's Table, ſeeing you affirm they are regenerate, and born of Water and the Spirit? But if you were put to prove, that Infants, whom you ſprinkle, have the inward Grace which entitles to Baptiſm, you would never be able to make demonſtration to your own, or any wiſe Man's Satisfaction; for is not the inward and ſpiritual Grace, Repentance, whereby Sin is forſaken, and Faith, whereby the Promiſes of God are ſtedfaſtly believed? And what Infant did you ever know thus qualified for Baptiſm?

Mr. *Taylor*'s Argument 11.

All who are Believers, ought to be baptized: But Children are Believers: Therefore Children ought to be baptized.

ANSWER.

1. The *Minor* Propoſition, that Infants are Believers, is not true. And I anſwer in the Words of Dr. *Hammond*, who ſaith, (Letter of Reſolut. p. 297.) *I ſhall profeſs to be none of thoſe that are concerned in the Queſtion, Whether Infants have Faith? I freely confeſs to believe, that Faith is ſo neceſſarily founded in Underſtanding, that they that have not Underſtanding, cannot have Faith, whether actual or habitual.* And Dr. *Jer. Taylor* tells us expreſly, *Whether Infants have Faith? is a Queſtion to be diſputed by Perſons, that care not how much they ſay, and how little they prove.* Thus theſe two Pillars of the Church of *England* explode your Argument, as an egregious Error.

2. And for that place, *Mat.* 18. 5, 6. by which you would prove Infants Believers, the Learned of your own Church expound it to a contrary Sence, and take the *little Child that believeth, to be a true Chriſtian, that hath laid aſide all worldly Pride, whereby he is become abject in the ſight of the World.* I ſhall not contend with you about the proper ſignification of πιστεύειν, (profeſ-

ſing my ſelf no Scholar) tho *Ludovicus Vives* uſeth παῖς for an Houſhold-Servant. But it is ſufficient to my purpoſe, that you dare not ſay Infants are actual Believers; (nay, you confeſs, *they have not actual Faith:* And for imputative Faith, (if there be any ſuch thing) yet it can be no Rule for the baptizing any Body, ſeeing it is not revealed to whom Faith is imputed; and whilſt you ſay, God may eſteem Infants as Believers, another may as well ſay, he may eſteem them as baptized alſo); I ſay, your granting Infants have not actual Faith, you can take the word, *believeth*, Mat. 18. 6. only by the Figure called *Proſopopœia*, if you will needs have the Child an Infant of Days. And if it be good arguing from hence to the Baptiſm of Infants, then you may argue as ſtrongly for baptizing the whole Creation, (if you can tell how) for it is ſaid to *groan, expect, and wait for the manifeſtation of the Sons of God, and to be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption.* Rom. 8. 19. We conclude then, that it is not a figurative Faith, but an actual Faith, (at leaſt by profeſſion) that entitles to the reception of Baptiſm.

3. We do not ſay, that God will impute Unbelief to Infants, but only to thoſe that refuſe to believe; and tho we know Infants are not Believers, yet we do not ſay or think they are Unbelievers, they being not capable to ſin againſt God in that caſe, or any elſe. And Unbelief preſuppoſes a capacity in the Subject, and means ſufficient, to believe, and yet the Creature refuſes to believe. The Sin of Unbelief therefore being no way chargeable upon any Infant, it follows by neceſſary Conſequence, that they have no capacity for Faith. Neither do we pretend to judg Mens Hearts; for tho God has ordered Faith to be a Pre-requiſite to Baptiſm, yet we are only to judg of the Profeſſion of Faith, not of the Sincerity of it. And as it is true, as you ſay, that Infants cannot play the Hypocrite; ſo it's true, they cannot play the Chriſtian, and therefore not fit for the Duties of Chriſtians, of which Baptiſm is one.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 12.

They who are capable of the Ends of Baptiſm, may be baptized: But Children are capable of the Ends of Baptiſm: Therefore they may be baptized.

AN-

ANSWER.

1. If by the Ends of Baptiſm, you mean the Things which concern God's Mercy in the Redemption of Man only, then the *Major* is denied; but if by the Ends of Baptiſm, you mean the Things required on Mans part, then the *Minor* is not true; for Mortification and Vivification are the Ends of Baptiſm on Man's part, of which Infants are not capable; for they cannot put off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, nor have they any need ſo to do, neither can they riſe to Newneſs of Life. And tho I grant, (and have often ſaid it) that we ought to devote our Children to God in the beſt manner we can; yet to go beyond the Word of the Lord under that pretence, will neither profit us, nor our Children.

2. What you ſay here, of Baptiſm being a Seal to Infants, *&c.* is anſwered before. And ſurely the word *Heathen*, (ſo often uſed by you) as it imports ſometimes an Enemy to God, (yet being of it ſelf of no ill ſignification) Infants are not ſo to be accounted Heathens; nor doth the word, *Chriſtian*, as it imports a Follower of Chriſt, belong to Infants. So that this is only a Noiſe of Words, to talk that our Infants are not diſtinguiſhed from the Infants of Heathens, tho I have ſhewed a difference between them.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 13.

Whom the Church of Chriſt ever received to Baptiſm, may ſtill be baptized: But the Church of Chriſt hath ever received Children to Baptiſm: Therefore they may be baptized.

ANSWER.

1. The *Minor* Propoſition is not true, and therefore I do deny, that the Church hath always received Infants to Baptiſm. And indeed you do not ſo much as pretend any thing from the Scriptures to prove it, but, before, do honeſtly confeſs, *That Infant-Baptiſm is not mentioned in the New Teſtament*; and therefore certainly it will be impoſſible to prove, that the Church did always receive Infants

Infants to Baptiſm. And it is alſo very obſervable, that *Euſebius*, who wrote the Hiſtory of the Church for four hundred Years after Chriſt, does not ſo much as mention Infant-Baptiſm at all.

2. But how then does Mr. *Taylor* prove his *Minor?* Why, his chief Author to that purpoſe is Mr. *Walker*, in his Book called, *A modeſt Plea for Infant-Baptiſm*; which Book in that part has been anſwered by Mr. *De-Laune*, to which I refer the Reader. The Sum of which Anſwer is to prove, that all Mr. *Walker*'s Teſtimonies from Antiquity for Infant-Baptiſm, for the firſt 300 Years after Chriſt, are either invalid, or taken out of forged and ſpurious Books. And it is more than ſufficient to ballance Mr. *Walker*'s and Mr. *Taylor*'s bold Aſſertion, *That the Catholick Church hath always received Infants to Baptiſm*, by the contrary Teſtimonies of *Ludovicus Vives*, and Dr. *Barlow*; the firſt expreſly ſaying, *In old Time none was brought to Baptiſm, but he was of ſufficient Years to know what that myſtical Water meant, and to require his Baptiſm, and that ſundry times.* The other tells us, *There is neither Precept nor Practice in Scripture for Infant-Baptiſm, nor any juſt Evidence for it for about 200 Years after Chriſt.*

2. You ſay, *That for many hundreds of Years the Queſtion* [about Infant-Baptiſm] *was not moved.* But this is a great Miſtake; for *Tertullian* did queſtion it, as an *unwarrantable Practice*, in the beginning of the third Century; as is ſhewed by Mr. *Tombes*, and others, who have diligently enquired into the ancient Cuſtoms of the Church.

3. The firſt Inſtance which you bring for the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm in our Nation, is that in King *Ina*'s time, about the Year 692; but we can prove it was oppoſed by the *Britain Biſhops* two hundred Years before this. See *Fabian*'s *Chron. part* 1. *fol.* 107.

4. You ſay, *The deferring of Baptiſm among the Ancients, was not for their queſtioning Infant-Baptiſm.* But ſure, if they did think themſelves too young to be baptized, at twenty or thirty Years of Age, they could with no reaſon think their Children old enough for Baptiſm at ſeven or eight days old. Extremes have undone all; they were too ſlow, and you are as much too quick. But the proper time for Baptiſm is, when Men attain to the new Birth; Baptiſm is therefore rightly call'd the *Waſhing of Regeneration.*

5. You ſeem to hold, *That Infant-Baptiſm was lawfully practiſed by God's People before Chriſt, and even from the Apoſtles Time ſince Chriſt:* But I wonder by what Law; you give us none but Mr. *Walker*'s Book, which is very well anſwered by Mr. *De-Laune*, in

in his Book entitled, *Truth defended.* And I am ſure, the beſt Antiquity ſays nothing for you.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 14.

That Doctrine which introduceth many Unchriſtian Conſequences, is erroneous: But the Doctrine of the Antipœdobaptiſts *introduceth many Unchriſtian Conſequences: Therefore the Doctrine of the* Antipœdobaptiſts *is erroneous.*

ANSWER.

1. The *Minor* Propoſition is not true; for our Doctrine in the Caſe of Baptiſm is true, and Truth does not introduce any erronious Conſequences. Now that our Doctrine is true, appears thus: Becauſe it fully agrees with your Text, *Mat.* 28. 19. even as it is expounded by your ſelf, in theſe Words, πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε, *Going to diſciple all Nations, inſtruct them in the Principles of my Religion; and then, being Diſciples, baptize them.* This you ſay, and this we ſay; the only difference is, *We do as we ſay,* but *You ſay and do not:* You therefore muſt needs be in the Error in this caſe.

2. But let us hear what you have againſt our Doctrine. Firſt, you ſay, *It oppoſeth the whole Current of Scripture, nullifies many Scripture-Promiſes and Privileges, and deſtroys the Covenant of Grace, as the premiſed Pages manifeſt.* But I hope the premiſed Anſwers do manifeſt the Charge which you bring againſt our Doctrine to be very unjuſt. And ſeeing you are the Men, and not we, that have changed the Ordinance of Baptiſm, you may juſtly fear the Cenſure of the Prophet, *Iſa.* 24. 5. *for breaking the everlaſting Covenant.* See the Place, and conſider it ſeriouſly.

3. You ſay, *Our Doctrine introduceth the World into Gentiliſm or Heatheniſm, and makes Chriſt's Church always gathering, and never gathered.* But how can you ſay this, ſeeing we are for the teaching or diſcipling all Nations, and every Perſon in the Nations, as they are capable, and God gives his Miniſters opportunity; and we take the ſame way to do this which the Apoſtles uſed, according to our Ability; *i. e.* to preach the Goſpel to every one that will hear us, and to bring up our Children in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord? And what tho the Church be thus always gathering, does not *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. warrant this Practice

to,

to the end of the World? and if you do not thus gather your Children to Chriſt, they will never be Chriſtians by your Croſſing and Sprinkling them.

4. Your talk of excluding Infants from the Covenant, is anſwered before, and proved untrue; what you add, of our *introducing of deſpair of the Salvation of Infants*, ſhews your Self-contradiction. For now you ſeem to make Infant-Baptiſm ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that if they be not baptized, we muſt deſpair of their Salvation: Than which what can be a more erronious Conſequence of your Doctrine of *Pœdo-baptiſm?*

5. It is apparent that our Doctrine makes the Covenant eſtabliſhed by Chriſt better than yours (whatever you ſay here to the contrary); not only becauſe we aſſert the Grace of God in the Buſineſs of Salvation to extend to Infants more generally than you do: But alſo for that it ſhews, God has not impoſed any Ceremonies upon them, as he did upon the Jewiſh Male Infants of eight days old. Whilſt your Doctrine makes your Croſſing and Sprinkling them of ſuch importance, as that if it be denied them, deſpair of the Salvation of Infants is *genuinely introduced*, pag. 74. As if God had tyed the Salvation of all the Infants in the World to a Ceremony. Thus does your Doctrine make the Covenant eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, worſe than the Law of *Moſes*; for under it the greater part of the Infants of the Jews were ſaved, without being Circumciſed, to wit, all the Females, and all the Males under eight days old: But you have no hope for Infants Male or Female, tho but of a day old, if it be not ſealed with your pretended Baptiſm. *Lord, whither will Men go when they forſake thy Word!* They will make Chriſt an *Impoſtor*, if Infants be not capable of Baptiſm: See Mr. *Taylor*'s Book, *pag.* 72. *n.* 5.

6. You ſay, *Our Doctrine equals the Children of Chriſtians with the Children of Turks, &c.* But we have ſhewed the advantage to be on the part of the Children of Chriſtians. And what if God, willing to magnify his Mercy and Goodneſs, has provided a Saviour for the innocent Babes (dying in Infancy) throughout the World? What need this trouble any Body? muſt our Eye be Evil, becauſe his is thus Bountiful? We know that he hath concluded all under Sin, that he might have Mercy upon all. And if God hath not Mercy on poor dying Infants, ſo as to ſave them all by Chriſt, pray ſhew what Mercy he hath upon them? Sure it had been a Mercy they had never been born, but not one *Iota* of Mercy to be born,

only

only to cry, dye, and go to Hell. Can you think that ſuch Doctrine befriends the Covenant of Grace? I think not.

7. To what you ſay (or have ſaid) about the Form of Baptiſm, you much miſtake us if you think we do not baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. The Article of our Faith, which you point to, was not written (as I conceive) to teach any to diſpenſe Baptiſm in different Forms of Words, but to ſhew that the Name of Son is to be taken, *as he is our Lord and Saviour.* Yet let me tell you, that I can ſhew it under the Hand of ſome now in your Miniſtry, that ſays *Matth.* 28. 19. does not impower any to uſe that Form of Words in Baptiſm, and ſhews alſo that the Learned are not agreed in that Matter. However, I am one with you, as to the uſe of the Form there ſet down, and no other.

Of the manner of uſing Baptiſmal Water.

1. Mr. *Taylor* grants, *the Mode of Baptizing is laid down by our Saviour, and expreſſed in the Word* Baptizontes, *baptizing them*, Mat. 28. 19.

Now this is very well, and I am glad he has done this Holy Ordinance ſo much right, as to acknowledg Chriſt to lay down (in his Commiſſion *Mat.* 28. 19.) the Manner or Mode in which it ought to be performed. But then, I am ſorry to ſee my good Friend ſo ſoon forget himſelf, as in the very next Page to tell us, that the Mode of Baptizing *is an indifferent thing; left to the Prudence of the Church, whether to dip or ſprinkle. Neither of them being commanded, nor either of them abſolutely forbidden by the Precept of Baptizing.* What ſhall I ſay to this? If *Baptizontes* be the Precept for Baptizing, and yet commands nothing, neither to dip nor to ſprinkle, nor abſolutely forbids either, ſure then we keep no Command in doing either, nor do we break any in omitting both. Pity it is, that Men to uphold their own Tradition, ſhould thus fight againſt both Scripture and Reaſon. For, if our Saviour, by the Words *baptizing them*, command nothing, then its beſt to do nothing; if he command both dipping and ſprinkling, then both muſt be done; if he command but one of theſe, then but one of them muſt be done: Let him chuſe which he will, he muſt chuſe but one. But yet he tells us otherwiſe, *pag.* 76. for ſaith he, *The Word* βαπτιζω *equally admits of both Significations, as is granted by the*

beſt Criticks: And quotes chiefly Mr. *Walker*'s *Doct. of Bapt. p.* 60. to *p.* 64. For anſwer, I ſay, if the word βαπτίζω do equally ſignify dip and ſprinkle, then unleſs we will be unequal we muſt do both; or elſe ſhew which of them may lawfully be omitted.

As for Mr. *Walker*'s Book, I have ſeen it, and obſerved that he plays with the Word βαπτὼ, βαπτίζω, βαπτίζοντες, βαπτίσμῳ, till he makes their Signification altogether uncertain, and ſets the Learned together by the Ears about the meaning of theſe Greek Words. And indeed, according to Mr. *Walker*, no Man can certainly know when he hits right upon the thing to be done in Obedience to this Precept, *Baptizing them.* As if our Lord ſhould leave his Apoſtles, and they leave us to gueſs at his meaning; in a Paſſage wherein he commands nothing certainly. And yet to go round again, however we uſe Water in the Name, *&c.* we can hardly go beſides the meaning of Chriſt: For if we dip the Subject in the Element of Water, we are right; if we ſprinkle it upon any part of the Body, (for you can aſſign no one part more than the other) we are right ſtill; if we dip the Head only, or only the Foot, we are right; if the Head, or Breaſt, or Hand only be ſprinkled, ſtill we are right. Now who can think, that our Saviour ſhould uſe an ambiguous Word, which is to guide us in matter of Fact? Do not Men that thus deal with the Word *Baptize*, make him the Author of all our Conteſts in this Caſe? And aſſuredly Mr. *Walker* has run many a one into a maze, about the meaning of βαπτίζω, and I am ſorry to ſee Mr. *Taylor* to follow him. But ſith he refers me alſo to Mr. *Leigh*'s *Crit. Sac.* He ſhall do well to mark what he ſaith (even as quoted by Mr. *Walker*, *p.* 36.) the reaſon (ſays he) why βαπτίσμῳ is put *pro Lotione & mundatione*, is, becauſe ſuch as are immerſed (that is, dipped) come *out of the WATER* waſhed or cleanſed.

So then, to Baptize, is to dip the Subject in the Element in the Name, *&c.* and that which is no ſmall, but a moſt important Confirmation of that Mode (and only that) is the Baptiſm of Chriſt's own Perſon; for Mr. *Walker* cannot deny, that the Greek in *Mark* 1. 9. being rightly rendred in Engliſh, is thus read; *Jeſus came —and was baptized of John INTO JORDAN*, and therefore he may be confident he was not ſprinkled, for it would be nonſence to ſay he was ſprinkled *into Jordan*; but good ſence and plain truth too, to ſay he was dipped *into Jordan.* And yet for all this, Mr. *Walker* fights ſtoutly both againſt Truth and Reaſon, leaning only

only upon the ſingle Authority of *Bernard*, and will have Sprinkling to be meant or ſignified by the Word *Baptize*, as well as Dipping. And Mr. *Taylor* ſays the ſame, tho many learned Writers contradict them both.

But it ſhall ſuffice here to ſet down two, both equal in Learning and Vertue to theſe our preſent Oppoſites. The firſt ſhall be that truly Famous Man, Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, in his *Rule of Conſcience*, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. *If you would attend to the ſignification of the Word*, *BAPTISM ſignifies plunging in Water, or dipping with waſhing.* And ſaith *Keckerman*, *Immerſion not Aſperſion* (that is, dipping not ſprinkling) *was the firſt inſtitution of Baptiſm, as it doth plainly appear from* Rom. 6. 3. *Syſt. Theol.*

But for all this, Mr. *Walker* pretends Antiquity for Sprinkling, and it is ſtrange to ſee what learned Men will ſay, when they are ſet to defend Error. We will but touch two of his moſt ancient Inſtances, that you may ſee the bottom of the buſineſs.

1. He goes as high as the ſecond Century, and takes an inſtance of ſprinkling from the ſervice of the *Dæmons* (that is, Devil-Gods) but why ſo? Becauſe he ſuppoſes the Heathen uſed ſprinkling in the Service of their *Dæmons*, in imitation of the Chriſtians Practice. But the truth is, it's more to be feared, that unwary Chriſtians did fall to imitate the Heathens; for we are told ſo in effect, even by a learned Popiſh Author, which for the plainneſs of the Teſtimony, I will here faithfully tranſcribe. He ſaith, ---*This chief Chair of the Church being tranſlated from* Antioch *to* Rome: *He* [Peter] *and his Succeſſors, were very careful and vigilent to reduce the Chriſtian Religion (being as yet indigeſted, unpoliſhed, and little practiſed) and the Profeſſors thereof, into better Order and Uniformity, out of the Law of* Moſes *(which Chriſt came not to aboliſh, but to fulfil) out of the Civil and Politick Government of* Romans, Greeks *and* Egyptians, *and out of both ſacred and prophane Rites, Laws, and Ceremonies of other Nations, but moſt eſpecially by the wholſom Doctrine and Direction of Chriſt Jeſus, and the inſpiration of the Holy Spirit.* See a Book called, *The Manners, Laws and Cuſtoms of all Nations*, *pag.* 151. Behold here the Springs of Human Inventions and Ceremonies.

Mr. *Walker*'s ſecond Inſtance, is a Story of one ſprinkled with Sand, inſtead of Water (the Water being ſcarce, and the Party like to dye): but alas they could not dip the Sick into the Sand, and however their Zeal may be commended, their Action is not

to be commended at all: It ſhews their Folly, for it's better to be without a Ceremony, when we cannot poſſibly have it in God's way, than to ſet up our own Devices in the ſtead, and place, and uſe of it. *For I will* (ſaith God) *have Mercy and not Sacrifice.*

And thus we ſhall leave Mr. *Walker* to conſider his Sandy Foundation for his ſprinkling Infants.

2. Mr. *Taylor* ſays, *Sprinkling cannot nullify Baptiſm, and therefore our diſſenting Brethren are to blame, to make our Baptiſm to be eſſentially corrupted, and not to be accounted Baptiſm, becauſe not performed by Dipping.*

To this I anſwer; When our Saviour commanded to baptize, he commanded but one, not divers kinds of Actions; and to do that, which is not only contrary to his own bleſſed Example in this very thing, but alſo ſuch an Act as cannot with any equity of Speech, or good Sence, be called Baptiſm, is to err eſſentially in the performance of it. And ſo great is the difference between Dipping and Sprinkling, that ſuch as ſprinkle Infants dare not ſpeak as they act, when they pretend to baptize: No, they dare not ſay, I ſprinkle thee in the Name of the Father, *&c.* which they might well ſay, if the word Baptize does equally ſignify dipping and ſprinkling.

We are not therefore to blame, to labour to have this Ordinance kept as it was delivered, for ſure if it be our Duty to keep God's Ordinances, it's our Duty to keep them as they were obſerved by Chriſt, and the Primitive Churches. And ſo far as the manner of doing this command of Chriſt is eſſential to the Ordinance, dipping is of the eſſence of it, without which it cannot be called Baptiſm.

Again, All the Scriptures which command to baptize, do expreſly command to dip the Party to be baptized, and therefore Mr. *Taylor* is to blame, to ſay, *There is not one place of Scripture which in expreſs Words commands Dipping*, pag. 59. Yea, Sir, your Text, *Matth.* 28. 19. commands Dipping: For were βαπτίζοντες tranſlated into plain Engliſh, it muſt be rendred by dipping. And I pray Sir, conſider, whether you could not with a good Conſcience tranſlate it ſo? And on the other ſide, Whether your Conſcience would not accuſe you, ſhould you tranſlate the Text, Teach all Nations, ſprinkling them? I dare ſay no Man dare thus read the Text. Why then do they thus act? Shall we ſpeak one thing, and do another? *So ſpeak ye, and ſo do ye, as they that ſhall be judged by the Law of Liberty*; to wit, the Goſpel.

3. What

3. What you urge from the Legal Waſhings, has been anſwered by the Learned of our way, and particularly by Mr. *Danvers*, who ſays, *I have carefully examined all the Places in the Old Teſtament, where the word* Dipping *or* Baptizing *is mentioned, and do find it is expreſſed by the Hebrew Word,* טבל, *as* Minceus *and Dr.* Hammond *obſerve. The Septuagint do render the Word* Tabal *in the Hebrew, by* βαπτιζω, *and with all the Tranſlators, both the Latin, Dutch, Italian, French, and Engliſh, do tranſlate* to dip; *the Word rendred* Waſhing, *being another Word, as the following Scriptures inform you,* Gen. 37. 31. Exod. 12. 22. Lev. 4. 6. & 17. 14. & 6. 16, 51. Levit. 9. 9. Deut. 33. 24. John 3. 5. Numb. 16. 18. 2 Kings 5. 14. I cannot think therefore, that you can conſcionably parallel *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Col.* 2. 11. with the Jewiſh Waſhings, which are expreſſed by the word רחץ, not the word טבל (as Mr. *Danvers* further ſhews.) And ſure I am, that *Rom.* 6. and *Col.* 2. is ſo very clear for our way of baptizing, that the Learned of your way do grant theſe Places allude to the ancient way of baptizing, which (ſay they) was by dipping the Party into the Water.

4. What you ſay of your Sprinkling to be as ſignificant as Dipping, is not true; for indeed unleſs it be commanded to ſignify the Death, Burial, Reſurrection of Chriſt, and our Mortification and Vivification, it can ſignify none of theſe things. Otherwiſe every time you waſh your hands, might ſignify what is ſignified in your Baptiſm; yet you will not ſay it doth ſo. And the ſame Anſwer may ſerve to what you ſay, of Sprinkling and Dipping, being equally obliging; for unleſs God hath given them to oblige, they have no obliging Nature or Virtue in them.

5. What you ſay of the Scarcity of Water, can be no Plea for you that have no want of it, whatever it may be for them that have it not. But ſure, where God gives not Straw, he will require no Brick. He does not make Baptiſm ſo neceſſary, that we ſhall periſh if we cannot, but rather if we will not obey him therein.

6. Your Surmiſe, that Dipping ſeems an indecent thing, is indecently ſaid, both by Mr. *Walker*, and your ſelf, ſeeing it may be done as decently as your Sprinkling; for your Talk of tranſparent Garments, ſhews your unacquaintedneſs with the right way of Baptizing. And know this, your ruffling Ladies in their gorgeous Apparel, may work upon your pravity of Heart ſooner, than to behold an humble penitent Sinner, cloathed in comely, tho mean Garments, to be buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm.

7. To

7. To your Objection about the Coldneſs of the Climate, you need but put on the Garment of Love to God and his Truth, and act from a Principle of Faith, and you need fear no Ill, tho this Path may ſeem to you as the Valley of the Shadow of Death. Yet if any Perſon be really weak of Body, and cannot be ſatisfied to delay, (as I confeſs that may be dangerous) there may ſuch care be taken, as in the Eye of Reaſon no Inconvenience need be feared. And if the Water be frozen, (as you object) ſurely he that will allow us to thaw that for our natural, will not blame us, if we do ſo for our ſpiritual uſe.

8. Does plunging or dipping take away the Underſtanding? Why, not more now than in Chriſt's Time. And is it ſo neceſſary that the Underſtanding act in the Duty? I marvel then why you baptize Perſons (as you call it) when they are aſleep.

9. What you ſay of the great Labour of dipping, and the Impoſſibility for one Man to baptize 3000 in one day, and that it is therefore unreaſonable to think the Apoſtles did dip all that they baptized, &c. I anſwer; Firſt, you grant then, that they dipped ſome that they baptized; prove now that they ſprinkled ſo much as one, and the Diſpute is at an end. Secondly, But Sir, what need was there for one Man only to baptize the three thouſand? *Acts* 2. 40. Does not Mr. *Walker* himſelf ſuppoſe, that there were of the hundred and twenty Diſciples, eighty two in a Miniſterial Capacity, to wit, the Seventy two, beſides the Apoſtles? Surely they might eaſily baptize three thouſand in a few hours.

But you will now prove the Lawfulneſs and Reaſonableneſs of Sprinkling; let us hear what you ſay.

1. You now *make Sprinkling not only equally ſignified in the word,* βαπτίζω, *but to be more congruous with its genuine Signification; your reaſon is,* βαπτίζω *being a Derivative, can admit of no larger Signification than its Primitive* βάπτω, *which we find* (ſay you) *in the Hiſtory of* Nebuchadnezzar, *when like a Beaſt,* ὑβάφη, *he was wet with the Dew of Heaven.*

But for Anſwer; 1. I ſay, this Place in *Dan.* 4. will never prove, that Sprinkling is more congruous to the genuine Signification of βαπτίζω, than Dipping: For *Nebuchadnezzar* being ſeven Years to live with Beaſts, out of Habitation or Houſe, was ſufficiently waſhed, eſpecially being probably naked too; ſo that this kind of wetting holds ſome reſemblance with plunging in Water,

Water, there being no part free from the Water thus rained upon *Nebuchadnezzar*: In which reſpect, it ſeems, the Septuagint renders or expreſſes his lying open to the Snow, Hail, Rain, or Dew, ſo long a time, by the word, βάπτω. And, 2. My Anſwer is, That the Greek here is *Hyperbolical*, and not properly to be underſtood; and our Tranſlators knowing this, did not (as I ſuppoſe) tranſlate the Word according to its proper Signification, our Language not well bearing it in that caſe, but according to the thing which was to befall *Nebuchadnezzar*. And it ſeems very diſingenuous, for you to conclude from this *Hyperbole*, that Sprinkling is *more congruous* to the ſignification of βαπτίζω, than Dipping, tho in ſo ſaying you contradict moſt of the Learned that have interpreted the word, βαπτίζω. And I am ſure, (and you know it much better than I can tell you, for my Learning is nothing, when compared with yours,) that our Lexicons, Dictionaries, and Grammars, do make the prime Signification of βαπτίζω to be a *dipping*, as they do who dye Colours; and *Scapula* does not make βάπτω, nor βαπτίζω, to ſignify Sprinkling at all.

2. What you ſay in your 2*d*, 3*d*, 4*th*, and 5*th* Particulars, is anſwered before; but here you ſay, *The Church was never confined to that Mode of Dipping, but had ſeveral Ways of baptizing, dipping, or ſprinkling*, &c.

I anſwer: What Uſages the Church has had, is not the Queſtion; but the Ground of her doings is the matter of our Enquiry: But yet I will venture to ſay, ſhe was always confined to dip, if ſhe kept that Ordinance according to Chriſt's own Example, which I think is a better Expoſitor of the word βαπτίζω, than any *Lexicon* in the World.

2. The Alteration of the manner of this Ordinance, has not only occaſioned us to ſay, You that only croſs and ſprinkle are not baptized; but the *Muſcovites* declare the Latin Church to be unbaptized for the ſame reaſon. For this you may read *Daille* on the Fathers, *lib.* 2. *p.* 148. where he tells us; 'The Cuſtom of 'the Ancient Church was to plunge thoſe they baptized over Head 'and Ears in Water, as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Epiphanius* teſtify. 'And this is ſtill the Practice of the *Greek* and *Ruſſian* Church at 'this day, as *Caſſander de Baptiſmo*, pag. 193. And yet notwithſtanding this Cuſtom is now aboliſhed by the Church of *Rome*; and 'this is the reaſon why the *Muſcovites* ſay that the *Latines* are not 'rightly and duly baptized. Thus he. Nor is this the only

Cauſe

Cauſe why we think your pretended Baptiſm a Nullity, for your Error about the Subject is more than the other.

3. What you ſay further is, to make us believe that Chriſt did not go into the Water; that the Eunuch went to the Water only, becauſe the Prepoſition εἰς ſignifies *ad*, to. But your Conſcience will tell you, it ſignifies *into*, as well as *to*; and indeed you grant it: and then to what putpoſe do you quarrel our Tranſlation? However, we have proved that Chriſt was baptized in the River: and 'tis expreſly ſaid of the many Thouſands which came to *Jordan*, that they *were all baptized in the River, confeſſing their Sins.* Now, Sir, here ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, cannot be rendred *to the River*, nor *with the River*, (without egregious Folly) and then 'tis very plain, that they were all dipped in the River; for it had been abſolute Folly to go into the River to ſprinkle the Face, Hand, or any other part of the Body. Seeing then they went into the River to baptize, it ſhews it cannot rightly be done without going into the Water: and therefore of neceſſity we muſt underſtand, *Dipping* is the only true Mode of *Baptizing*.

4. I marvel how any wiſe Man can look upon that Text, *John* 3. 23. John *baptized in* Enon, *--- becauſe there was much Water there*, and ſo much as think Sprinkling to be a lawful way of baptizing. If he will uſe any of his Wit, he cannot but infer, Baptiſm could not be rightly done with a few drops of Water, ſeein *John* choſe *Enon, becauſe there was much Water there.* And what tho πολλὰ ὕδατα ſignify many Waters? yet it does not ſignify many Rivers; but by the Noiſe of many Waters, is often meant the Noiſe of much Water in one Source or Channel. However, you ſay, the Greek ſignifies the Confluence of theſe two Springs, *Jordan* and *Jaboc*; but yet you are unwilling that they ſhould yield ſo much Water as might ſuffice to dip in. And yet the Scripture tells you elſewhere, that *Jordan* overflows all her Banks at certain times; and *Lithgow*, that was at it, will give you an account, that it is a River ſufficient to dip a bigger Man than your ſelf in.

But here, you ſay, *is no mention of dipping.* Yes, Sir, but there is; for when you hear, that *John* was baptizing in *Enon*, he was either *dipping* or *ſprinkling*. The latter would make the Speech abſurd and nonſenſical; the former therefore was his Buſineſs, for *he was dipping in* Enon, *near* Salem, *becauſe there was much Water there.*

Your Church therefore is very much to blame, in leaving the Way

Way of Truth, and following her own Tradition, and is therefore the cauſe of our preſent diſunion, and will be till ſhe turn to the Truth, both in the Subject and Manner of Baptiſm, or at leaſt forbear to impoſe upon us without Authority from Heaven.

What you add, by way of anſwer to ſome of our Objections againſt Infant Baptiſm, is anſwered in my Reply to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and Mr. *J. Barret*, which is bound up with my Book of *Primitive Chriſtianity*, and to that I will refer you. What you add about Sureties or God-Fathers, *&c.* I ſhall not take notice of at this time, and indeed the uſage is ſo odd, that Dr. *Jer. Taylor* well ſaid, if it had been God's will to have had them, *It is to be ſuppoſed he would have given them Commiſſion to have tranſacted the Solemnity with better Circumſtances, and given Anſwers with more Truth; for if the God Fathers anſwer in the Name of the Child (I do believe) it is notorious, they ſpeak falſe and ridiculouſly.* And this is even enough to ſay to ſuch an Innovation: But what abſurdity is it, which being once made a Cannon by learned Men, will not find ſome to daub it up with untempered Mortar? Could Men but remember *Nadab* and *Abihu*, *Lev.* 10. they would fear to add to, or take from the Ordinances of Chriſt, under what pretence of Piety or Prudence ſoever.

Thus Sir, I have briefly anſwered your Arguments, and hope I have not miſtaken your Sence in any Paſſage I except againſt. And for a Concluſion, I crave leave to ſay, That the way to obtain that Unity which is ſo deſirable, between the Baptized Believers and the Church of *England*, is not to fall to it by Diſputation, but by propoſing what Abatements may be made about ſuch things as are not mentioned in the Scripture, (as this of *Pædo-Baptiſm* is not) or at leaſt what mitigation may be hoped for, as to the impoſition of ſuch things: And on the other ſide, I truſt in the Lord that you ſhall call for nothing from us, wherein we may ſubmit without ſinning againſt God, but we ſhall gladly hearken to you.

In the mean time, conſtant Prayer to God for the Bleſſing of Truth and Peace, and friendly conference between the leading Men on both parts, may do much to further ſo good a Work, ſpecially if his Majeſty would be graciouſly pleaſed to permit ſuch friendly Treaties. But of writing many Books there is no end.

Sect. IV.

A Plea for the Church-Aſſemblies of the Baptized Believers.

MAny and very great has been the Sufferings of the Baptized Believers in this Nation, ſince the publication of the Act, entitled, *an Act to prevent and ſuppreſs ſeditious Conventicles.* And if the meaning of the ſaid Act be to reſtrict all Chriſtian Aſſemblies, (except the Parochial) to the number of four Perſons, beſides the Families where they do aſſemble, We ſee not how we can, with ſafety to our Souls, conform to the Limits thereby preſcribed. But foraſmuch as the ſaid Act pretends only the prevention and ſuppreſſion of Seditious Conventicles, We humbly conceive, that thoſe who are free from Seditious Deſigns in their meeting together to worſhip God, are rationally acquitted from the Imputation of Sedition; and conſequently no Man can conſciencioufly proſecute any of us upon that Statute, being utterly unable to prove any ſuch Crime againſt us; nor could any ever yet convict us of ſuch an Evil, nor, by the Grace of God, ſhall they (I hope) ever be able to do it.

Upon a due Enquiry it will evidently appear, that it is the Lord himſelf that hath ordered his People to convene or congregate, for the better diſcharge of the great Duties of Prayer, Preaching, and the Celebration of other his holy Ordinances; to which holy Ends he has allowed, not four Perſons only, but the whole Church, in any Town or City, to come together into one Place, among whom alſo ſuch as do not believe the Goſpel, are allowed to appear, in order to their Illumination, and this without any limitation in reſpect of Number: So that it ſeems to exceed the due Bounds of humane Power, to uſe Reſtraint, where God hath given ſuch gracious Liberty. 1 *Cor.* 14. 23, 24, 25. *Jam.* 2. 2, 3. *Heb.* 10. 24.

Foraſmuch then as God has not given any Power upon Earth, to forbid any Chriſtian, or ſuch as deſire to know Chriſt, to hear his Word at any time, or in any place; but on the contrary, commands every Man that hath an Ear, *to hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches,* Rev. 2. 7. ſaying, *To day if ye will hear his Voice, harden not your Hearts,* Pſal. 95. 7. Proclaiming *to every one that thirſteth, to come and take of the Waters of Life freely:* Iſa. 55. 1.

To

To whoſe gracious Invitation the *Spirit and the Bride* (the Church) agreeth, ſaying, *Come*, Rev. 22.17. It muſt needs be very dangerous for any Man to ſay, *Do not come*, when they deſire to drink of theſe living Waters, which flow in the lively Preaching of the Goſpel of Chriſt. And how can we think that our gracious God, who in Things pertaining to this Life, will not allow us to *ſay to our Neighbour, Go away, and come again to morrow, and I will give, when we have it by us*, Prov. 3. 27, 28. will ever accept us with a *Well-done, good and faithful Servant*, if in the more weighty Matters of his Law we put Men off with delatory Anſwers? *Behold, now is the accepted Time; behold, now is the Day of Salvation.*

It muſt be granted, that the Church is the Light of the World, a City ſet upon a Hill, that cannot be hid; whilſt therefore we are conſcionably, and (we truſt) groundedly perſuaded, that we are a part of this Church, a neceſſity lieth upon us, to *make manifeſt the Savour of the Knowledg of Chriſt in every Place.* For as it was truly ſaid to Chriſt, *That no Man doth any thing in ſecret, and himſelf deſires to be known openly*: So neither muſt the Church of Chriſt obſcure her Light by a ſecret Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, leſt ſhe contradict her own Prayer, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches, held forth in theſe Words: *God be merciful to us, and bleſs us, and cauſe his Face to ſhine upon us, that his Way may be known upon the Earth, and his Saving-Health among all Nations. And now, Lord, behold their Threatnings, and grant unto thy Servants, that with all boldneſs they may ſpeak thy Word. —— And they ſpake the Word with boldneſs. —— And they overcame him by the Blood of the Lamb, by the Word of their Teſtimony; and they loved not their Lives unto the Death. —— And became Followers of the Churches of God, having received the Word in much Affliction, with Joy of the Holy-Ghoſt.*

And if for the like faithful Teſtimony we muſt ſtill ſuffer, as we have done, we ſhall rejoyce, as Chriſt hath exhorted us. The Church is taught of God to hold faſt, not her Faith only, but alſo the Profeſſion of her Faith; and this not by Starts and Girds, as Men give them Licenſe or Toleration, but with all conſtancy, and without wavering. And ſurely our Lord foreſeeing, and by his Apoſtles foreſhewing what would come to paſs, required that this Profeſſion be held without wavering in the Buſineſs of Church-Aſſembling, *Heb.* 10.25. becauſe without ſuch Aſſemblies, the whole Service of God (in a Church-way) is like to fall to the ground.

This Duty, as it is of greateſt importance, ſo it is founded upon Heavens Authority: *Forſake not the Aſſembling of your ſelves to-*

gether. And it is granted by the learned Proteſtants, *That againſt the Law of God or Nature no contrary Cuſtom doth ever prevail.* [Dr. *Field* of the Church, lib. 4.] *He that doth any thing by Command from the King, contrary to the Command of God, does not fear God,* (ſaith Dr. *Savage*, Chaplain to K. *Charles* II, in his *Dew of Hermon*, *p.* 36, to 39.) And, ſpeaking of the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, he ſaith, *Their Rulers enjoined them not to preach Chriſt, and therein they did well to diſobey; for otherwiſe they had not feared God, inaſmuch as tho their Rulers were above them, yet God was above them both.* —— *For in commanding any thing contrary to the Word and Will of God, they abuſe their Power, either through their Ignorance or Wilfulneſs; and in that caſe meerly Paſſive Obedience is to be yielded.* Theſe latter Sentences are the more remarkable, being written by one of his Majeſties Chaplains, in Anſwer to a Book written by the Baptized Believers in this Age, entitled, *Sion's Groans for her Diſtreſſed*; which Book, whilſt he pretends to confute, he has confirmed it, in the main ſcope and Intent of it.

As it is impoſſible, by Mulcts and Penalties to overcome the faithful Profeſſors of the Truth, (*for that which is of God, Men cannot overthrow*, Acts 5.39.) ſo neither will thoſe that are zealous for Error, be vanquiſhed by that way. And the miſchief is, their Errors are by their Sufferings made the more taking with thoſe of weak Judgments. What then is the reſult of Perſecution for Religion? Is it not commonly this, That the Hypocrites or Time-fervers do fill that Church which has the Power of the Magiſtrate on her ſide? And ſuppoſe ſhe have the Truth on her ſide, yet thoſe Temporizers come not to her Communion for the Truths ſake, and therefore cannot be a Bleſſing to her, nor ſhe to them; nay, theſe ſhall, the ſooneſt of all others, betray her, when ever Time ſhall miniſter occaſion; for thoſe who are not true to God, and their own Conſcience, will never be faithful to Men. *They worſhip not the King of Heaven, but the Earthly Crown and Scepter, much like* Euripus, *carried headlong ſometimes this way, ſometimes that way.* Socrat. lib. 3. cap. 21.

But, ſhortly, to ſum up what is or might be further ſaid in this Caſe.

1. To reſtrict our Aſſemblies to the *Limits* of the ſaid Act, is to obey Man rather than God, who gives liberty, without limiting the Numbers of thoſe that meet, to worſhip him in a Church-way. And whilſt we believe our Aſſemblies are true Churches, we muſt endeavour to meet in God's way, whoever countermands it.

2. For

2. For thus to limit our Aſſemblies to the Number of Four; will certainly deſtroy all our Church-Aſſemblies: For, ſuppoſe ſome Congregation or Church conſiſt but of an hundred Perſons, theſe being divided into Fours, have no Church-Aſſembly, unleſs every of theſe four be a Church. And if the Magiſtrate have juſt power to divide us into Fours or Fives, he has power to ſubdivide us into Two's, and by conſequence to diſſolve all our Aſſemblies. I confeſs, a ſmall Number may conſtitute a true Church. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, tho a Biſhop, had a Church conſiſting but of ſeventeen Perſons. [*Baſil. de Spirit. Sanct.* cap. 29.] Our Saviour has promiſed his preſence, where *two or three are met together in his Name*. But then *in his Name*, ſignifieth in his Authority, and according to his Appointment. Now Chriſt has no where appointed, that four, and no more, ſhould come together into one Houſe or Place; no, tho an hundred Perſons be come together, if more do come, they cannot be prohibited by all that Power which God has given to Man, as we have ſhewed.

3. Our zealous Country-Men of the Parochial Way, would think it very unlawful to be limited in their Meetings to fours or fives; and yet they ought to be reſtrain'd from Seditious Practices as well as others; and we do by as good Right think it unlawful for us to be ſo reſtrained. We hope our Legiſlators did not intend at all to exalt their Authority againſt the Lord, whoſe Power is above all. But yet when theſe *Laws* come to be executed upon good Men, by the Induſtry of mercenary Fellows, meerly for worſhipping God, then are they turned into Snares to the ruin of the Innocent, and diſhonour of that Power which gave them being. And all this falls out, for want of better proviſion in the ſaid *Laws*, to convict Men of Sedition, than only becauſe they were obſerv d to preach or pray.

4. Wherefore, being fully ſatisfied that our Aſſemblies are true Church-Aſſemblies, and that upon the ſtricteſt enquiry we are able to make into the due Nature and Order of ſuch Aſſemblies, we conceive our ſelves indiſpenſibly bound by the Word of God, the Examples of the firſt and beſt Churches, and the Tie of Conſcience, as regulated by a ſincere *Love* of Religion, to hold faſt the Profeſſion of our Faith without wavering or changing, by reaſon of the Change of Times, or Man's *Laws*. Being alſo rationally perſuaded, that the more publick and free Men are to ſerve the Lord, the leſs danger of Sedition. Wherefore, with innocent Hearts, and pure Hands, (as to any Deſign of Sedition) in the ſtrength of Chriſt, we will keep his Way, and let the Lord do with us as ſeemeth him good.

SECT.

Sect. V.

Of the Baptized Believers Call to Christianity, and to the Work of the Ministry.

When our Saviour commanded his Apostles *to teach all Nations*, and to *preach the Gospel to every Creature*, We do not doubt but their performance *of this his gracious Will*, may truly be said to be the *calling of the Gentiles*, or *Nations*: And that Men enjoy a great Mercy (for which they ought to be very thankful) to be born in a Nation to whom the Gospel has been preached, and received by their Progenitors: And that it is also a great Blessing to be born under the Government of Christian Princes; and we believe we ought to love and honour our Nation, and the Rulers of it, upon this very account (as well as for the Obligation of Nature and Laws) *viz.* because they assert the Interest of Christ Jesus in general as well as we.

Nor is it our Business to destroy the State of Christianity received in any Nation; nor at all to despise the Ministry that conscientiously upholds it (but only to labour that Christianity may be delivered from the Errors that have encumbred it, by reason of the change of Governments and Interests, or Corruptions of the Ages past.) And in this Consideration, as we look upon our Nation to be a Christian Nation; so we count our selves much more happy in being Members of a Nation that owns the true God, Christ Jesus to be the Saviour of the World, the Scriptures to be holy and true, and that Faith and Holiness is the way to true Blessedness, than to have been of any other Nation whatsoever.

But yet for all this there is a great Truth in the Words of *Tertullian*, i. e. *We are not born, but made Christians.* And therefore, we do not think that our meer Birth of Christian Parents does qualify us, or give us an actual Right to Christ's Ordinances; but to this end we believe, and know, that every Person ought to have the Gospel preached, or some way made known to them, and that a work of real Grace (or the new Birth) at least by a solemn Profession, must precede our Baptismal Covenant; to this the Scriptures give full consent, *John* 1, 12, 13. 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Eph.* 2. 10. 1 *Pet.* 1. 23. And thus we, and ours (so many of them as the Lord our God does call by the preaching of the Gospel) are actually incorporate

corporate with the Church of Christ Militant, and engaged thenceforth in the high and holy Calling, and actual Profession of the Christian Religion.

2. But now, Whether we have any lawful Call to the work of the Ministry, is the business to be a little considered, partly, for that some of our late Persecutors were pleased to suggest the contrary; and partly to put our selves upon the strictest Trial, even in this case where we are supposed to be the most deficient.

The Questions in this case to be resolved, are,

1. *Whether a succession of Ordination from Man to Man, down from some of the Apostles, be absolutely necessary to a due Call to the Ministry?* or,

2. *Whether the same Means that is of Authority sufficient to make Men Christians, be not also sufficient to make Ministers?*

In answer to these Questions, we shall do little more than offer what we have formerly written upon this Subject. And tho the *Papists* are the Men who stand most stifly for Succession, as necessary, yet of late we find our Friends of the Church of *England* looking that way, as if they would justify their Ordination in a successive Line from Man to Man, through the Papacy: which thing is disclaimed by Dr. *Luther*, with the greatest vehemency, in these words. 'Whoso loveth Christ, ought to endure any thing, rather than 'to be ordained by the Papists; because in their Ordinations all 'things are carried with such wicked preposterousness, that if they 'were not mad, and blind, they would perceive how they mock 'God to his Face; — being stricken with an universal blindness, 'they do not so much as know the Word of God, specially the 'Bishops who ordain. ——Let me be counted a Fool, a Knave, a 'Lyer, if there be any one of them, ordain'd by them, who dare 'say, that at such time as he received Orders, he was commanded 'to dispense the Mysteries of Christ, or to teach the Gospel, ---but 'they ordain Sacrificers of the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, and 'to hear Confessions, &c. Thus far *Luther*. And the Oath which they take at their Ordination (as set down by Mr. *Bullinger*) is very un-gospel-like, the sum of it is in these Words, *That the Priest will be a true Subject to the Pope, obey the Decrees of the Fathers, and of the Church* (i.e. *the Roman Church*) *and that he will persecute Hereticks.*

Beza censures all Ordination taken from the Papists. Let us hear him speak. 'What ordinary Vocation is that which you say the 'first Reformers had, excepting some few of them, is it not the Pall? 'Shall we think then, that the Popish Orders are valid, in which 'there is not any preceding enquiry into manners? No such En-

quiry

quiry or Procedure, as is inviolably to be made, or obſerved, by Divine Right in Elections, and Ordinations, — Shall we think ſo highly of their Ordinations, that as often as any falſe Biſhops are converted to true Chriſtianity, immediately all the Filth, Uncleanneſs, and Impurity, collated, is waſhed away? Nay, but with what Face or Conſcience will he be able to forſake Popery, and not abjure his irregular Ordination? or if he do abjure it, how can he by virtue thereof claim Authority to teach?

Thus theſe two Pillars of the Proteſtant Reformation, are ſo far from deriving their Call to the Miniſtry, through the Papacy (as ſome late Proteſtants pretend to do) that they do utterly reject any Ordination which comes from them. Nor was *Luther* and *Beza* ordained after they came from the Papiſts. (Mr. *Stub*'s *Occaſ. Quær.*) But *Beza* is ſaid to defend his Call to the Miniſtry, by Inſtances of thoſe that were called extraordinarily, as *Iſaiah*, *Daniel*, *Amos*, *Zecharias*, &c.

Theſe things premiſed, we may aſſume, that either of theſe ways (as approved by our Reformers reſpectively) could we go to defend our Call to the Miniſtry, as well as they: Being firſt, many of us, ordained by thoſe who received Ordination from you, and ſome may run with you to Biſhop *Cranmer*, who was ordained by the Papacy; and then proceed, till we come up to *Clemens*, or *Lucius*, and ſo to St. *Peter*.

And as for the pretence of *Beza*, or *Luther*, about their extraordinary Call, it's not impoſſible for us to give as fair a Demonſtration of it, as either of them, (ſpecially if we take the Rules given by Mr. *Beza*, to judg of ſuch a Call by, to be cogent, *viz. good Life*, *ſound Doctrine*, *and the Election of the People.*) But to be plain, we do not very well like either of theſe ways. Not the firſt, it is ſo ſordid, as that the Papiſts themſelves in deriving their Call through the Papacy, are forced to take it from ſo many falſe pretended Popes, or Diabolical Popes, even Witches and Devils incarnate (by their own confeſſion) that they make but a lamentable Succeſſion of it in the end. And eſpecially, if *Stapleton* may be regarded (tho a Papiſt) who tells us, *That it is not a bare and perſonal Succeſſion*, *but lawful Succeſſion*, *which is a note of a true Church*; and defineth that to be *lawful Succeſſion*, *when not only the latter ſucceeds into the void rooms of thoſe that went before them*, *being lawfully called thereunto*, *but alſo hold the Faith which their Predeceſſors did.* Now let this Rule be honeſtly ſtood by, and we are ſure the Papiſts ſhall never be able to prove a Succeſſion of many points of

of their Faith, and Doctrines from the Apoſtles, whilſt the World ſtands, and conſequently neither can the Proteſtants derive a lawful Succeſſion from them.

We like not the ſecond way, for we will not compare with *Iſaiah*, *Daniel*, *Amos*, nor *Zechariah*, in reſpect of their immediate Miſſion. But this we ſay, That our Call to the Miniſtry is no otherwiſe extraordinary, than our Call to believe the Goſpel is ſo; or, as it ſtands clear from all the idle Ceremonies uſed by Papiſts, or others in their Ordinations, or as it is ordered (as near as we can) according to the Word of God. And is the ſacred Word of Power to beget us to God, and by the aſſiſtance of his Spirit to make us his Children, or Chriſtians? and is it not of Power or Authority ſufficient to enable us to worſhip God in his own Ordinances, which were made for Chriſtians, and not Chriſtians for them? This ſeems juſtly ridiculous.

We make no doubt but that it's eaſy with God (and no extraordinary thing) to raiſe a People to himſelf, in a Nation where all have corrupted the way of Chriſtianity, (or loſt the State and Praiſe of a true Church) meerly through his Bleſſing upon the reading and diligent ſearching of the Scriptures, (I ſpeak of a Nation where the Scriptures are received, as that is our caſe.) The Truth is, all the ways of God's Worſhip, are (in the Word) made ready for us, and laid at our Doors, and we do but take up gladly, what others let lie as uſeleſs things, that they may hug their own Devices.

But now to ſilence a Papiſt for ever (which ſome will think to be a difficult undertaking); do they not allow (even by the Pen of the Learned *Bellarmine*, *chap.* 7.) that even an Heathen, that is not baptized, may adminiſter Baptiſm in caſe of Neceſſity? And this they eſteem a valid Baptiſm. And why then may not we, when God hath opened our Eyes to ſee any other Truth, as well as that, enter upon the dutiful obſervance of it in the beſt way we can, our Circumſtances (eſpecially the caſe of Neceſſity) being conſidered? For is not Neceſſity as good a Warrant to take up the practice of, or to reſtore one Truth as well as another? Certainly, one Ordinance is as ſacred as another, and where Churches are ſetled, ought to be diſpenſed in the moſt honourable way, and by the moſt fit Inſtruments, even Chriſt's Miniſters. Wherefore, till the Papiſts ſhall recal their opinion about Baptiſm, and prove a Succeſſion as neceſſary to Baptiſm as Ordination, they can with

no ſhew of reaſon, inſiſt upon the neceſſity of Ordination to be founded upon Succeſſion. But further,

It's evident from the Scriptures, (*Acts* 13.) that a Succeſſion is not neceſſary to true Ordination; for tho the Apoſtles were yet living, it was not thought neceſſary that they ſhould impoſe Hands upon *Barnabas* and *Paul*: but this is done by gifted Men, or the Prophets that were in the Church at *Antioch*. The only queſtion here to be reſolved is, *Whether this laying on of Hands was for Ordination?* The Papiſts do hold it was; ſome Proteſtants deny it; but ſome Proteſtants do affirm it. Mr. *Churchman*, in his Hiſtory of *Epiſcopacy*, tells out of *Chryſoſtom*, *That tho* Paul *was an Apoſtle neither of Men, nor by Men, yet as for the Work to which he was ſeparated, ask the ſaid Father* (ſaith he) *and he will tell you*, εἰς τὴν Ἀποστολὴν, *That it was the Office of an Apoſtle, and that he was ordained an Apoſtle here, that he might preach the Goſpel with greater Power, — And certainly that he had not the Apoſtleſhip before, may be made manifeſt by that which followed after.* But tho ſome Proteſtants doubt whether this were *Paul*'s Ordination (tho the matter is clear of it ſelf) yet here is the Ordination of *Barnabas* without all queſtion; and then it is evident that there was an Interruption of Succeſſion in the caſe of Ordination, even in the Apoſtles Days, and therefore by no means to be held to be neceſſary in our Days, who are ſo far removed from the times of the Holy Apoſtles, that in vain do Men think to find a clear and undoubted Succeſſion, of any one Ordinance from them. Wherefore we may ſafely conclude, that where the Truth of the Goſpel is received, with the Gifts of God's Spirit (as that was the caſe at *Antioch*) there is a ſufficiency of Power on the Perſons ſo gifted, with the advice of the Church to ſend forth, or appoint Men to the work of the Miniſtry; altho 'tis true, this courſe is moſt warrantable in the caſe of neceſſity, and in no wiſe to be done in contempt or wilful neglect of that way, which is more ordinary and regular. Howbeit, to tye all Power of Ordination ſo ſtrictly to the Perſons of Men ordained, by ſuch as were ordained by the Apoſtles themſelves, would in all likelihood throw the Power of Ordination out of the Church of God at this day; eſpecially if we ſtand upon the due Election and Qualification of Perſons ſo claiming Succeſſion from the Apoſtles themſelves.

And becauſe due Qualifications, and Election, is as neceſſary to a true Miniſter of Chriſt, as Ordination, ſeeing it's moſt certain, that unleſs God do firſt make Men Miniſters, it's impoſſible for the Church

Church (rightly) to make them Miniſters. We ſhall here add, That beſides his moral Vertues, and Spiritual Gifts, he that is regularly called to the Miniſtry, muſt firſt be a true Member of the Church, and choſen by a true Church to that ſacred Employment. And then we may boldly (yet modeſtly) ſuppoſe, that true Ordination (at leaſt in ſome part of it) is only found in the Congregations of Baptized Believers at this day: For, where true Baptiſm is not, Ordination cannot be regular. Again, due Election is found amongſt them, whilſt neglected both by Papiſts, and Prelatiſts. And further, the true Form and Order of Ordination is found in our Churches. The firſt is evident of it ſelf, *No Baptiſm, no due Ordination*; is a Truth without exception among all that own Ordination. And for the ſecond, 'tis certain none are ordained to any Office in the Baptized Churches, till elected by the conſent of the Church, or the Major part, to whom they are to miniſter.

And herein they follow the Footſteps of the Apoſtles, *Acts* 1. when one muſt be choſen in the room of *Judas*, the 120, which was the whole Aſſembly, allowed the choice of two: and good reaſon there is, that where all are equally concerned, they ſhould all be ſatisfied in the choice of ſuch, as to whom they commit the care and feeding of their Souls.

When the ſeven Deacons were to be ordained, the whole Church is conſulted, *Acts* 6. and the Election made by them who knew the qualification of the Perſons.

And as holy Scripture, ſo Antiquity ſtands with us in this caſe. The *Nicene Council*, writing their minds to the Church at *Aelxandria*, concerning ſome that were to ſucceed other Biſhops, gives theſe Directions: *If ſo be they ſhall ſeem to be worthy, and the People ſhall chuſe them.* What Rules were to be obſerved in reſpect of their worthineſs for Miniſterial Employment, may be gathered from *Clement, Epiſt. ad Corinth. Having* (ſaith he) *made trial of them by the Spirit, to be Biſhops and Deacons.* And again, *Others well approved of, ſhould ſucceed into the Office and Miniſtry, who therefore have been conſtituted,--by famous and diſcreet Men, with the good liking and conſent of all the Church, — and who withal, have of a long time had a good Teſtimony from all Men.*

Leo gives the ſame direction (*Epiſt.* 84. *c.* 5.) charging, *That none be ordained againſt the Wills and Petitions of the People:* And again, *Epiſt.* 49. *The Cuſtom was that he ſhould be choſen of all, that was to be over all, and wills, that the liking of the People and their Teſti-*

mony be ſought: That in Ordinations, the Rules of the Apoſtles and Fathers ought to be obſerved; that he that is to be over the Church, ſhould not only have the Allowance of the Faithful, but the Teſtimony alſo of them that are without.

Cyprian is as clear for us, (*Ep. l.* 1.) The People who full well and perfectly know the Life of him that is to be ordained Biſhop, are to be preſent, and to be choſen with their allowance, who know the Converſation of every one. And he brings *Salinius* (his Colleague) for Inſtance, who was choſen by the Voice of the whole Brotherhood, and the Judgment of the Biſhops which came together.

Each Church ſtands free (ſaith Dr. *Bilſon*, Perpet. Govern.) *by God's Law to admit, maintain, and obey no Man as their Paſtor without their liking; and that the Peoples Election dependeth on humane Fellowſhip, and firſt Principles of humane Society and Aſſemblies.*

Dr. *Field* informs us, *That this Right of the People hath been invaded many ways*: 1. *By great Perſonages and Magiſtrates.* 2. *When the Biſhops grew to great Pomp, and the Clergy began to be enriched by Benefices, Elections were, and to this day are made according to the Intereſts of the Rich and Strong, whilſt the People are not only deprived of, but become ignorant, that any Right remains in them to chuſe their own Miniſters or Paſtors.*

Now this Privilege, tho loſt in moſt National Churches, is reſtored and maintained in the Baptized Churches, where none are elected Meſſengers, Biſhops, or Deacons, without the free Choice of the Brotherhood where ſuch Elections are made. And after ſuch Election of Perſons of known Integrity and competent Ability, we proceed to Ordination, with Faſting and Prayer, and the laying on of Hands, according to the Scripture; *Acts* 13.3. *When they had faſted and prayed, they laid their Hands on them, and ſent them away.* Thus for the Ordination of Meſſengers, (which after the manner of ſome are called Biſhops.) *Acts* 14. 23. *And when they had ordained them Elders in every Church, and prayed with Faſting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed.* Acts 6.5,6. *And they choſe* Stephen, *a Man full of Faith, and of the Holy-Ghoſt, and* Philip, *and* Prochorus, *and* Nicanor, *and* Timon, *and* Parmenas, *and* Nicholas, *whom they ſet before the Apoſtles; and when they had prayed, they laid their Hands on them.* Thus for the Ordination of Deacons. All which Apoſtolical Practices are religiouſly reſtored and obſerved in the Churches of the Baptized Believers, without any deviſed Adjuncts of our own or others. By all which it may

appear,

appear, they have a lawful Call to the Work of the Miniſtry.

Here I meet with an Objection; *'Tis doubted by ſome, whether a Man having received Ordination as a Presbyter, may afterward have Ordination as a Meſſenger of the Churches of Chriſt, the Objector ſuppoſing that the firſt Ordination is ſufficient, only the Church muſt give him another Commiſſion.*

This Objection I anſwer three ways: 1. By Antiquity. 2. By Reaſon. 3. By Scripture.

1. Antiquity is directly againſt this Objection, being rather for a threefold Ordination than only one, as I ſhall ſhew by and by. But firſt, I marvel how the Objector would give a Man a Miniſterial Commiſſion without Ordination, the Church having no other way at all to give Commiſſions but by Ordination; nor can any Man tell us, how ſhe can give her Commiſſions Miniſterial, but by the very Act of her Ordination; and according to the Nature of her Ordination, ſuch, and no other is her Commiſſion.

Now our Ancients underſtood this, and therefore did uſually bring Men gradually to the degree of a Biſhop, (*i. e.* a Meſſenger, according to the Scripture, Biſhop, or Overſeer, being a Name common to Elders in the Primitive Times.) Thus *Chryſoſtom* was firſt ordained a Deacon, then a Presbyter, after that he was ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, by *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*. And ſaith the learned *Bilſon*, *In the Primitive Church they were firſt Deacons, and upon Trial, when they had miniſtred well, and were found blameleſs, they were admitted to be Elders; and after that, if their Gifts and Pains ſo deſerved, they were called to an higher degree: ſo that every one, by the ancient Diſcipline of Chriſt's Church, before he could come from miniſtring to governing in the Church of God, received thrice, or at leaſt twice, Impoſition of Hands.* *So Sozom. l. 6. c. 12, 13.*

2. Reaſon tells us, that every Man that is called to the Work of the Miniſtry, ought to have a Commiſſion (that is, an Ordination) commenſurable to his Miniſtry. It is Chriſt's peculiar to give Commiſſion by the Word of his Mouth only, the Church cannot do ſo; ſhe muſt confer Miniſterial Authority in ſome ſolemn Rite or Ceremony. This is plain in the caſe of *Deacons*, it was not ſufficient for the Apoſtles to ſay (of Perſons eminently qualified) we order or appoint them to ſerve Tables, or, look ye to the Poor: But beſides their great Qualifications and Election, they muſt receive their Commiſſion or Authority by Prayer, with the laying on of hands, elſe they have no Commiſſion. In like manner *Presbyters* muſt be ſolemnly

ſolemnly ordained, before the Holy-Ghoſt hath made him an Overſeer of the particular Flock committed to his Charge. And then in reaſon, if he have a far greater Charge afterward committed to him, he has need of a Commiſſion (that is, an Ordination, for other Commiſſion there is none) to enable him to take care of many Churches, and to plant new Churches in the World. We read not of any Meſſengers, that acted as ſuch in that great Truſt, without an Ordination agreeable to their Work; and it is ill venturing to ſend Men out with a Commiſſion too ſhort for their Employment, it being irrational ſo to do, and without any good Example. Let us ſee then what the Scripture will ſay in favour of our Anſwers.

3. The Apoſtles had a twofold Apoſtleſhip; the one limited to the Jewiſh Nation, *Mat.* 10. the other of extent to all Nations, *Mat.* 28. If they were ordained to either, then they were ordained to both; and the latter ſeems to be the more ſolemn and formal Ordination, not only for that when Chriſt had given them Order what to do, he *lift up his Hands, and bleſſed them*, *Luk.* 24. 50. but alſo gave them Order to tarry at *Jeruſalem*, until they were *endowed with Power from on high*. When their Work was *particular* or limited, they had a limited Commiſſion; when their Work was *univerſal*, they had an univerſal Commiſſion. Sure the Church, who hath no way to give Commiſſions but by Ordination, ſhall do well and wiſely to follow Chriſt, the Author of all her Power, when ſhe delegates or gives it forth to any of her Miniſters. This Anſwer may ſuffice, yet we add:

Barnabas is confeſſed to have been one of the Seventy Diſciples, and had a divine Authority from Chriſt to preach the Goſpel to the Jews; but when he is ſent to preach to the Gentiles, he hath a new Commiſſion, even an Ordination, as appears, *Acts* 13.

FINIS.